



DESTINATION EXCELLENCE UPDATE AND PLANNING 1/2 DAYS 2020

Evaluation Report



FEBRUARY 19, 2021
FACULTY OF MEDICINE

Destination Excellence Update and Planning ½ days 2020

Evaluation Report

Contents

1.0 Background 2

2.0 Structure, Objectives, agenda 3

3.0 Feedback for the various project teams 4

4.0 Evaluations from participants 7

5.0 Lessons learned based on feedback 8

1.0 Background

In 2020 the Faculty of Medicine’s strategic plan, [*Destination Excellence*](#), entered its third year of implementation. As in previous years, an update and planning event was organized to provide stakeholders with information related to the implementation of the strategic plan and to solicit input on next steps. In 2020, the work of all of the project teams were impacted to some degree by an extended university closure due to a severe winter storm and then disruptions to the work environment due to COVID-19 pandemic restrictions. Despite the impact of the storm and the pandemic, the various project teams were able to meet most of their deliverables in 2020 and at this point some teams are ready to sunset.

The table below offers a brief snapshot of the status of the various project teams as of fall 2020:

Project Team	Status
Mentorship	This team concluded its work in the fall of 2019 and operational responsibility for the mentorship website and programs were assigned to the Office of Learner Well-being and Success (LWS).
Research	The final deliverable for the research project team was a series of recommendations to overcome barriers faced by clinical researchers. The research team will sunset after the final recommendations have been submitted.
Wellness	<p>The final deliverable for the wellness project team is a report containing the analysis of the results of the wellness survey from 2019 and a series of recommendations based on the findings.</p> <p>The wellness project team will sunset in early 2021 and a new Wellness and Well-being Advisory Committee (WWAC) will assume responsibility for oversight of wellness and well-being initiatives, including implementing the recommendations in the wellness survey report.</p>
Social Accountability	<p>The last remaining task for the social accountability project team was to make recommendations regarding how to productively and meaningfully engage with our communities and external partners.</p> <p>The Office of Social Accountability is being created based on a governance structure developed by the social accountability project team. As this office takes shape, the social accountability project team will sunset in early 2021.</p>
Balanced Score Card	Several focus groups conducted throughout 2020 resulted in a draft score card which will be implemented in 2021.
Culture of Excellence	This project team was formed in winter 2020 with a mandate to operationalize implementation of the recommendations in the Unit Assessment.

2.0 Organizing team, objectives, agenda

The approach to organizing the update and planning activities for 2020 was quite different than those in previous years. Firstly, an organizing team was put in place comprised of DEIST members representing different stakeholder groups. The organizing team consisted of (in alphabetical order):

- Dr. Shane Arsenault (PARNL representative)
- Ms. Gerona McGrath (co-chair)
- Ms. Michelle Osmond (Communications)
- Mr. Steve Pennell (HSIMS)
- Ms. Cindy Whitton (staff representative)
- Dr. Margo Wilson (co-chair, faculty representative)

One of the first decisions made by the organizers was related to the format of the sessions. Due to restrictions on public gatherings, the decision was made to hold all the sessions in a virtual meeting environment (WebEx) and, in recognition of the fatigue many have expressed regarding long online meetings, to have two ½ day events as opposed to one full day. The organizing team solicited the input of the DEIST members in the selection of the dates for the sessions, the time of day (morning or afternoon), objectives for the sessions and suggestions for special topics. The input that was received from the DEIST is available in **Appendix A**.

Based on the DEIST input, the following objectives for the day were developed:

- To update stakeholders on the work of the Destination Excellence project teams
- To inform stakeholders of initiatives related to Destination Excellence
- To solicit input from stakeholders regarding priorities for the coming year for project teams and for the strategic plan overall.

Despite some of the limitations of the online environment, the organizing team saw an opportunity to utilize a ‘flipped classroom’ approach to the sessions by having the respective co-chairs for the teams pre-record their presentations for review by participants before the live, interactive session. Another opportunity presented by the online venue was that enrollment in the events could be opened up to anyone because concerns about capacity limits in physical spaces was removed.

In previous update and planning events, the focus was very much on the individual project teams and their work. As the implementation of *Destination Excellence* matures, the organizing team felt this was a good time to expand beyond the work of the project teams and consider broader issues facing the Faculty of Medicine that impact the implementation of the strategic plan. Our Faculty of Medicine mission speaks specifically to meeting the unique health needs of our rural, remote and urban communities and advocating for Indigenous health, so the team felt sessions specific to Indigenization and diversity in academia would be valuable. To address excellence in education, a panel of educational leaders were asked to speak to how they addressed the challenges presented by Covid-19 and a session specific to undergraduate accreditation. The agenda for both two half days is available in **Appendix B**.

Registration data shows that 119 individuals registered for the November 20 session with 100 actually attending and 112 for the November 27 session with 89 actually attending.

3.0 Feedback for the project teams

Pre-recorded presentations were made available to participants approximately a week before the concurrent sessions took place. These presentations included questions or items the different teams were seeking input on. On November 20, concurrent sessions were held for the research, social accountability and wellness teams. The number of individuals that signed up for each session ranged from 26 to 39. Brief summaries of the sessions and input received are below:

- *Research*
“Pathways to engage more clinical faculty to research and scholarship”

The discussion was initiated by providing a brief preamble to the topic. Points of discussion during the session centred on, creation of research teams that include clinical and non-clinical scientists, entry level of research – i.e., providing a stepwise initiation to the research enterprise, champions of research in academic units, as well as greater integration of clinical research in teams across the spectrum. In addition, revisiting the mentorship pillar as an avenue to increase collaborations between clinical and non-clinical researchers. Also, providing envelopes of funding specifically designated for collaborative research projects for clinical and non-clinical researchers.

- *Social Accountability*

Participants were asked to address the question of community engagement with examples and discussion on successful strategies and what the Office of Social Accountability could offer to people in terms of building support for community engagement. There was consensus around the need for being present and visible in the community, taking programs, meetings, and events to community spaces and working with leadership within communities. Building community advisory committees and ensuring representation from local health authorities and people with lived experience were also recommended. Support could be provided in the form of information sessions, and/or workshops case examples on community engagement strategies. Participants also pointed out that monetary support for community partners was an important way to demonstrate respect for the time commitment given by community members, both individuals and organizations.

- *Wellness*

Attendees at the Wellness session were asked to consider three questions in advance of the session:

- Based on the themes and recommendations reviewed so far in the wellness survey, is there anything you would like to add or emphasize?
- Is the structure and mandate of the Wellness/Wellbeing Advisory Committee appropriate and complete?
- There are tremendous interactions between the FoM and other key stakeholders. What is the best way to collaborate with respect to workplace wellness as we move forward?

The live session was attended primarily by staff with a few faculty members also in attendance. While the conversation was engaging, many of the participants were relatively quiet. The key message from the discussion around the survey results was the importance of changing the culture within the Faculty of Medicine so there is flexibility and managers are allowed to manage. There were no suggested changes to the structure and mandate of the new Wellness/Wellbeing Advisory Committee. In terms of involving stakeholders, one faculty participant talked about the need to work with RHAs as their workplace is embedded within the hospital environment.

The second set of concurrent sessions took place on November 27 for the balanced score card, the culture of excellence and mentorship. The number of individuals who signed up for the different sessions ranged from 24 to 30. Brief summaries of the input received are below:

- *Balanced Score Card*

The session was well attended with good interaction and feedback. The current version of the balanced score card lists more than 60 potential metrics which align with specific goals and pillars of the strategic plan. The session focused on acquiring input for future planning and set up of measurement systems for data collection on the metrics. This involved acquiring information on Potential Sources (Where the data is held); Frequency (How frequently data should be gathered on the metric); Collection Tools that should be used to acquire data; the unit/centre responsible for acquiring data); and the metric validation process for each listed metric. The session time allotment was sufficient to acquire information under the Pillar (mainly “Excellence in all we do”) categories of Thriving learners and Graduates; Impactful Research; Healthier Communities; Research Excellence; Education Excellence: and Social Accountability; and under the “Excellence in all we do pillar”. Most of the discussion focused on which metrics should remain or be modified. Impactful Research and Research Excellence-related metrics remained an area of concern as to their relevance and adequacy in capturing the diverse types of research productivity from the diverse disciplines. Another set of common themes arose out of discussion of “Healthier Communities” and various metrics assessing “social accountability” and particularly community engagement. There was also considerable discussion about potential sources of information for various indices related to staff, faculty, and learner diversity and associated indices capturing information racism, inclusion, and equality. Concerning metrics aligned with “Thriving learners and Graduates” and “Education Excellence”, the importance of defining competency from the learner type (UGME/PGME/Graduate etc.), a comprehensive approach to determining all learner types, and aligning metrics according to learner type was emphasized.

- *Culture of Excellence*

In their flipped classroom presentation, the Culture of Excellence Project Team Co-Chairs provided a summary of the work completed by the project team to date. The proposed mandate was presented and feedback was requested from those who attended the session. The mandate presented was:

- Foster within the Faculty of Medicine a culture of professionalism, with environments free of any form of racism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia, discrimination, intimidation or harassment of any description and to value every individual regardless of race, colour, gender, religion, ethnicity or ability.
- Empower people within the Faculty of Medicine and its communities, in an inclusive and culturally safe environment which fosters equity.
- Support the sustainability of the implemented recommendations from the unit assessment.
- Appraise the learning and work environment to inform decision making within the Faculty of Medicine.

There was fulsome discussion from participants. It was agreed that a more streamlined version of the mandate would be more inclusive in that listing specific groups may result in some groups being omitted. As such, the mandate was revised to the following:

- Foster within the Faculty of Medicine a culture of professionalism, with environments free of discrimination, intimidation or harassment and to value every individual.
- Empower people within the Faculty of Medicine and its communities, in an inclusive and culturally safe environment which fosters equity, diversity and inclusion.
- Support the sustainability of the implemented recommendations from the Unit Assessment.
- Appraise the learning and work environment to inform decision making within the Faculty of Medicine.

Feedback from the planning day also suggested consulting with Tina Hickey, Memorial Equity Officer regarding the wording of the mandate. The Co-Chairs also asked the participants of the planning day for suggestions for process to implement recommendations from the Culture of Excellence Project Team. The Dean was in attendance and suggested that all recommendations would be presented to DEIST. If approved by DEIST, it would then be the responsibility of the tasked individual(s)/group to follow through on the action item.

- *Mentorship*

An overview of the developments regarding the new Mentorship program at the Faculty of Medicine was provided to participants in advance of the session. Based on feedback from participants, it became clear that mentorship opportunities are needed at multiple levels with mechanisms that allow for multifaceted connections among different groups. For example:

- Faculty to faculty
- Faculty to postgraduate learners
- Faculty to undergraduate learners
- Postgraduate learners to undergraduate learners
- Staff to staff, etc.

It was suggested that, moving forward, we could explore incorporating assessment tools to optimize the likelihood of successful matches. We also discussed the possibility of including mentor video bios in the mentor profiles. Furthermore, there was the idea that we could extend

the program to include mentors and mentees beyond the FoM in NL to include those elsewhere in Canada and internationally.

4.0 Evaluations from participants

Online evaluations were provided to participants at the end of both ½ days and completion was voluntary. A reminder to complete the evaluations were sent roughly a week after each set of sessions. A total of 86 evaluations were received with the following response rates:

Date	Number completed	%
November 20, 2021 (9 a.m. – noon)	57	47.8%
November 27, 2021 (1 p.m. – 4 p.m.)	29	25.9%

The participation rate on the second day was markedly lower than the previous week.

The specific breakdown of the respondents for November 20 is below:

Session date	Affiliation	Total number	%
November 20, 2020	Administrators/Staff	35	61.4%
	Clinical Faculty	15	26.3%
	Learners	1	1.8%
	MUNFA Faculty	5	8.8%

The specific breakdown of the respondents for November 27 is below:

Session date	Affiliation	Total number	%
November 27, 2021	Administrators/Staff	18	62.1%
	Clinical Faculty	9	31.0%
	Learners	0	0.0%
	MUNFA Faculty	2	6.9%

In terms of overall satisfaction questions, the sessions were generally well received.

Session date	Question	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
November 20, 2021	Overall success	57	88.2	11.3
	Overall organization	57	92.5	9.5
	Appropriateness of the presentations and activities	57	89.6	13.7
	Pre-recorded session value	52	86.7	18.6

Session date	Question	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
November 27, 2021	Overall success	29	88.0	12.4
	Overall organization	29	91.2	17.7
	Appropriateness of the presentations and activities	29	88.2	9.9

	Pre-recorded session value	27	88.8	15.1
--	----------------------------	----	------	------

In addition to the quantitative questions, several qualitative questions were posed. Overall the flipped classroom / ability to view the presentations ahead of time was very positively received but some respondents indicated they were not aware that they could view the presentations or did not have time.

Feedback on specific sessions:

Session title	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Indigenization Framework	52	89.9	15.6
November 20 Concurrent Sessions	49	86.3	16.7
Education panel	54	88.3	15.6
Diversity session	26	88.2	12.2
November 27 concurrent sessions	27	85.7	13.0

The complete results from the evaluations are available in **Appendix C**.

5.0 Lessons learned based on feedback

The evaluation results provided many comments that will inform the planning of future events. Most of the feedback related to the online format and the timing of the sessions, and input on how to improve the concurrent sessions.

Future format and timing

Based on the evaluation results, future *Destination Excellence* update and planning events will most likely be held in a virtual environment taking place over two ½ days. Since attendance at the Friday afternoon session was considerably lower than the morning session the week before, it might be advisable to have future events take place in the mornings and on different days of the week.

Flipped classroom / concurrent sessions

Most participants appreciated being able to view presentations ahead of time but it was suggested that the facilitators start the concurrent sessions with a brief summary of the recorded contents and have a slide with the questions so participants can see them. Another suggestion was to encourage participants to send in feedback to the facilitators ahead of the live sessions so the feedback could be discussed more thoroughly. It was also suggested that the concurrent sessions focus more on what needs to be done next as opposed to what was done over the past year.

Communication

Based on feedback this year, there needs to be clearer communication around directing participants to the pre-recorded videos and encouraging them to watch the videos before the live sessions. The mechanics of the actual concurrent sessions should also be more clearly articulated to avoid confusion about how to get into the different rooms and how to return to the main room.

Learner Participation

Based on the registration data, it is clear that learner participation across all groups was very low. For future sessions, there should be more of an emphasis on promoting learner attendance and having learners provide their perspective on the different sessions.

DESTINATION EXCELLENCE STRATEGIC PLANNING SESSIONS

Evaluation Summary (November 20th and 27th)

Prepared by:

**Office of Professional and Educational Development
Faculty of Medicine, Memorial University**

December 2020



1.0 Introduction

This report summarizes the evaluation (November 20th and November 27th) of the *DESTINATION EXCELLENCE STRATEGIC PLANNING SESSIONS*. These online sessions and concurrent break out rooms were hosted in Webex. These sessions facilitated inter-team communications from among the DEIST project teams where teams provided updates and solicited feedback from participants.

This evaluation further assesses the feasibility and acceptability of a novel structure to such sessions as the concurrent team presentations were pre-recorded and made available for review. This allowed in-session time to be dedicated to participant discussion.

2.0 Standard Evaluation Methodology

The standard module evaluation is based on the following:

Registration/Completion Data

Includes the total number of registrants, as well as a summary of aggregate statistics.

Satisfaction Survey Data

Evaluates participants' satisfaction and experiences with these sessions. Respondents are asked to rate the overall success of various aspects of the sessions on sliding scales from 0% to 100% success. Open-ended justification of responses as well as further feedback, comments and suggestions were also collected.

The data collected for this report was analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics 27.

3.0 Registration/Completion Data

3.1 Registrant Demographic Data

The first session had n = 119 registrants and the second n = 112.

Registrant Demographics November 20th – Table 1

Registrant Demographics	N	% of Total
Gender:		
Female	85	71.4%
Male	34	28.6%
Occupation:		
Specialist	28	26.2%
GP/Family Physician	13	12.2%
Other Medical Professional	5	4.7%
Resident	1	0.9%
Registered Nurse	1	0.9%
Student	3	2.8%
Other – Memorial Affiliations	56	52.3%

Registrant Demographics November 27th – Table 2

Registrant Demographics	N	% of Total
Gender:		
Female	83	74.1%
Male	29	25.9%
Occupation:		
Specialist	20	19.6%
GP/Family Physician	14	13.7%
Other Medical Professional	6	5.9%
Resident	0	0.0%
Registered Nurse	1	1.0%
Student	2	2.0%
Other – Memorial Affiliations	59	57.8%

4.0 Satisfaction Survey Data

Fifty-seven (n=57) registrants completed some or all of the questions on the first session survey (total number of respondents for each question is indicated) and twenty-nine (n=29) completed the second session evaluation. Completion of this survey is voluntary. All data presented in this section (demographic characteristics and survey findings) therefore applies only to these respondents.

4.1 Survey Response Rates and Base Demographics

Respondents' self-reported demographic characteristics are detailed in Tables 4-10.

Survey Response Rates – Table 3

Options	%	Total
November 20 th Response Rate	47.8%	57
November 27 th Response Rate	25.9%	29
		86

Response rates to the second session were much lower than evaluation participation from the first session. The Webex logs and records may be able to indicate whether most individuals stayed through to the final session of the November 27th Accreditation presentation. If a significant number left prior to program completion, the returned evaluations may be biased towards those engaged in the final session and underrepresents those who opted to leave. The morning versus afternoon timing of these two events may have impacted engagement.

Survey Respondents' Memorial Affiliation November 20th – Table 4

Options	%	Total
Administrators/Staff	61.4%	35
Clinical Faculty	26.3%	15
Learner	1.8%	1
MUNFA Faculty	8.8%	5
		57

Survey Respondents' Memorial Affiliation November 27th – Table 5

Options	%	Total
Administrators/Staff	62.1%	18
Clinical Faculty	31.0%	9
Learner	0.0%	0
MUNFA Faculty	6.9%	2
		29

4.2 Event Success

The findings presented in Tables 6-7 show that survey respondents were satisfied with this online program.

Overall Satisfaction Ratings – Table 6

Session	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	
Nov 20 th	Overall success	57	53	100	88.2	11.3
	Overall organization	57	62	100	92.5	9.5
	Appropriateness of the presentations and activities	57	32	100	89.6	13.7
	Pre-recorded session value	52	5	100	86.7	18.6
Nov 27 th	Overall success	29	33	100	88.0	12.4
	Overall organization	29	6	100	91.2	17.7
	Appropriateness of the presentations and activities	29	65	100	88.2	9.9
	Pre-recorded session value	27	36	100	88.8	15.1

If you would like to explain your responses, please comment here:

- Actually really liked the virtual format. Would have been nice to see everyone in person, but I think this was still effective (and very efficient).
- Did not watch pre-recorded presentation.
- Diversity and inclusion is such important work and I was delighted to see the Faculty of Medicine prioritize it.
- Event was well organized and relevant to the broader Strategic Planning initiative.
- Excellent morning Thank you to planning group and presenters

- Excellent sessions, particularly the plenary. The pre-recorded sessions were very useful and they enabled a more effective break out session delivery, and allowed review of information under different headings (not to be covered in chosen breakout session).
- Great presentations by great people. It is so helpful to hear updates from all units and the contributions made by all to a common goal.
- Great sessions. I took in the research session which Reza moderated very well and there was a lot of interesting discussion.
- Having the presentations pre-recorded allowed the breakout group to have more time for discussion
- Hugely valuable and made the time spent more constructive to have seen the videos beforehand
- I attended the social accountability. It would have been nice to have the questions posed during pre-recording posted during the session breakout room as a refresher.
- I attended the wellness break out session. A quick overview of the pre recorded presentation would have been helpful to remind us of the content and take home messages.
- I didn't have time to review the pre-recordings
- I found it gave me a perspective of how other areas operated. Thank you :)
- I like being able to access resources on my own time
- I prefer active discussions and presentations, rather than recorded information - makes me learn better, but this is a personal preference. Overall, it was a great event and great speakers/discussions
- I question the presentation which took place regarding the wellness survey. Last year, there was a stronger focus on IT, Finance and HR. This year, although the results of the survey are still unknown, the focus was only on HR (both faculty and staff). How can the same survey have a different result?
- I really liked this format. I appreciate the opportunity to participate online. If I had to multitask, I was able to do so without appearing disinterested in what was happening during the presentations or small group discussion. It's often really hard to carve out an entire day or half-day with little to no disruption.
- I think it was all very well done; the discussions and presentations were very insightful and should bring forward actionable items.
- I think the sessions today were excellent. They were timely, meaningful, and well-presented
- I thought it went rather well, and I loved getting the pre-meeting videos to bring me up to speed.
- I thought the session went extremely well and was just as informative as face to face.
thank you

- It allowed teams to highlight their work while also providing an increased amount of time for discussion.
- It was all just OK. I would have liked to know more about what I am supposed to do going forward. Not just "Here's what we have done." but rather "Here's what you can/should do now." Maybe I'm just personally aware of most of this, and I felt like it was a waste of time.
- It was good to have the information before the session to review.
- It was very interactive. The communication was good amongst all involved. Great for all sharing their knowledge and giving feedback. Good networking within Faculty of Medicine. Wonderful to be included in all the updating of resources. Well-being and engaging working together as a whole community.
- It would have been nice to be notified when the presentations were uploaded to be able to view them. It never entered my mind to view them prior however if I had been reminded I would have been more inclined to look for them.
- It's hard to find time to view and process the presentations ahead of time in the midst of a very busy teaching and clinical schedule, but the concept is a good one.
- Mentorship session was excellent.
- More time for discussion during the breakout session would have been helpful.
- The event Friday overall was good. Overall success of the larger program is yet to be realized, once some measures toward overall Medical School wellness, for everyone are implemented, people will feel "well" and gripe less. Personally, no visible/noticeable changes yet. Organization of event was pretty good. Some were not aware how breakout sessions would work, a pre-description of the process in email could have helped and pre-recorded content was not viewed by all. Maybe have less pre-recorded and more live presentations for each breakout but shorter. A presentation from each breakout could have been done for 5 mins to the entire group to gather the info from each breakout as a whole. Overall, I did find it a useful session and the breakout with smaller number of people was easier to manage. Good luck with the next (session) on Friday coming.
- The flipped classroom approach was a good one. We should have all watched all of them in order to be fully apprised of the work on the strategic plan.
- Unfortunately, I was unaware that they were available and did not view them prior to the session. I think, in future, it might be wise to remind attendees that the information has been uploaded.
- Very well organized. Everything went as smoothly as possible.
- When I logged in earlier I didn't see the presentations. On the day of the event I could see they were there but couldn't find them before that.

Breakout Session Satisfaction Ratings – Table 7

Session	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Indigenization Framework	52	15	100	89.9	15.6
November 20 th Concurrent sessions	49	30	100	86.3	16.7
Education panel	54	30	100	88.3	15.6
Diversity session	26	50	100	88.2	12.2
November 27 th Concurrent sessions	27	39	100	85.7	13.0
Accreditation session	27	60	100	87.1	11.4

If you would like to explain your responses, please comment here:

- As previously mentioned, I found the concurrent sessions more useful because of lower numbers of people, allowed people more time and comfort to give useful input. Maybe extend the time of concurrent sessions and reduce other presentations even by 10%.
- Concurrent-did not attend this session (x3)
- Concurrent session - although I was signed up, there were technical difficulties getting me placed in the room; in the end I only attended 1/2 the session. Discussion was useful.
- Education panel- have seen much of the information previously at different meetings. Concurrent- ran out of time. Useful to have ideas / responses submitted before session?
- Hearing perspectives from different individuals was awesome. In the indigenization part, the most impactful talk - in my opinion - was our resident's (John) perspective and story. Very well done. Individual's own stories highlight the most impactful messages
- I really enjoyed the diversity session, there is so much to learn and reflect upon! The accreditation session was very informative, Dr. Hearn did a great job explaining the process in a clear and concise manner.
- I think our diversity session could have been a little more focused and perhaps a panel but otherwise it was good. The concurrent session was a bit repetitive from much of the wok (sic) on the scorecard already. Accreditation was very informative.
- I thought I knew everything about accreditation, but I learned a lot. And the diversity part was excellent. Also the concurrent Culture of Excellence was very specific and practical
- I would have loved to hear more of a learner perspective at some points. Not sure if any learners med or grad were in attendance - but I really feel that their voices really need to be heard as they have been dealing with massive changes to their programs as well as the anxiety that can be associated with the future of your program of study becoming uncertain.

- Indigenization Framework - excellent overview. In future, could there be a small group discussion on this topic? Organization was excellent. Panel format - very informative and interactive
- It was good to hear the various speakers and the information they have to offer. To know where things are headed and to prepare for the future.
- Mentorship session was excellent.
- My concurrent session (Research) solicited opinions from participants. But they were so widely disparate ("clinicians shouldn't do research" to "researchers need to be in every clinical discipline") that I didn't feel like anything was accomplished. Also other panels seemed to be about "What we did" and not "What you (the audience) can do"
- Some small glitches in tech- other than that everything was great!
- The diversity session was excellent, however, my only comment is that given there was so much information, it seemed a bit rushed. That being said, I think it is something that all faculty, staff and students could benefit from seeing. The accreditation session was great. I think it is important that all staff have a basic understanding of accreditation, as all of our positions impact this, either directly or indirectly
- The Indigenization Framework session was particularly effective. I would have liked to have seen more time allocated for the question period at the end.
- The opportunity to review the slides is great for the sessions that I could not attend. The only thing about that is that I feel like I might have missed out on some good discussion regarding those areas.
- The score card group session could have used more time (or firmer facilitation) as it was not able to review all content for discussions. There needs to be a frank, high-level, discussion amongst senior leaders regarding research versus scholarship contribution, its value and recognition. The issue is imbedded in the very name: Research and Grad Studies; and within DEIST as Research Excellence; Impactful Research. Those of us in this session witnessed a subtle but deep disagreement between two Associate Deans. Not only should the optics be addressed that our senior leaders are not remotely on the same page regarding a core strategic area, but underlying that disagreement was a culture of disrespect against scholarly activities not resulting in peer-reviewed research. I witnessed subtle, but clearly communicated disrespect from a senior leader regarding the non-reviewed works of scholarship related to writing policy, or community engagement projects, or anything not held to the elitist standard of peer-reviewed "research".
- The topic of inclusion and diversity and equity are extremely important. It is something that needs to be a guiding principle and not an afterthought to correct.
- There didn't feel like enough time for questions for the Indigenization Framework or the concurrent sessions. Concurrent session would have been better if they had the question displayed for us during the discussion. Not sure I got much out of the

education panel. Perhaps it would have been better as a discussion of what the Associate Deans feel has been working -- disagreed with Dr. Curran that everything can be taught and assessed effectively online; appreciated Dr. Al Asaad's comment that some things cannot be taught remotely so we need to find a balance of some online and some in-person.

- There was a little bit of confusion as to how to enter and leave the breakout sessions and the timing for the bio breaks, but these were minor. I attended the Research session, it took some time getting the slide sharing to work, so lost a bit of momentum, but I felt we made up for lost time.
- Useful information was provided in all three sessions and participation from attendees seemed very helpful in guiding the overall strategic plan.
- Very technical
- We could have used more time for our break-out session but I wouldn't change the allotted time as otherwise the event overall might become too lengthy. There are probably other, offline ways to follow-up on some discussion points and feedback.
- Well organized Informative
- Wish there was more time for Q&A for the indigenization presentation.
- Working together as a team in whole. Continuing with success.

4.3 Survey Respondents' Feedback

What was your favorite part of the day?

- Accreditation
- Both indigenization (because I know so little about this important topic) and the social accountability (because it directly relates to my research and public engagement activities). Very excited to see work in this area at FoM, and cannot wait to see Social Accountability office being formed and become fully active. I hope that this office will work towards including researchers, not only the clinical services, in their agenda and activities. Overall, I think there is little emphasis on the importance and inclusion of research and public engagement activities than improving the clinical services and accessibility for our community)
- Breakout session x6
- Cathryn, Dr. Smith, and Dr. Jeddore.
- Concurrent sessions and the entire thing seeing familiar names and faces, in this pandemic time contact is needed to feel a part of something.
- Discussion in small groups looking for solutions
- Diversity talk
- Diversity, as well as accreditation
- Dr. Jeddore's presentation. Research concurrent session

- Dr. John Jeddore's presentation. That was great. Clinical Skills has been in meetings for two years plus now to incorporate indigenous curriculum into the clinical skills program so it was great to hear his perspective and experiences. I am excited for the learners to have, what I think, will be a unique, impactful and rewarding educational experience.
- Early presentations.
- Enjoyed the mentorship session. Great group and engaged discussion and constructive conversation
- Getting to see a lot of faces and putting a name with them. I am outside of town so I really liked just seeing everyone who spoke. It's nice to be able to understand and see what areas everyone is working in and issues they are dealing with on a daily basis
- Guest speakers on indigenization
- Hearing FoM leadership thank the staff for all the hard work
- I don't think I had a favorite part. I enjoyed the learning that came from the event.
- I enjoyed Catherine Anderson's presentation and her subsequent acknowledgement of John Jeddore's admission to googling the word "indigenization". It was a subtle nod to being open to learning opportunities. There is no one-size-fits-all solution for ignorance and discrimination but education is a great first step in the process.
- I enjoyed the ability to review the presentations in advance of the planning day. It made for better discussion in concurrent group.
- I like the open concept where you could give feedback.
- I liked the interaction in the concurrent sessions
- I liked the structure of the day in general and hearing from different people/focuses of the FoM.
- I loved the Indigenization presentations.
- I particularly found the concurrent session engaging since it was very interactive (Culture of Excellence) and provided a great opportunity for cross fertilization of ideas and perspectives.
- I really enjoyed the Indigenization panel. Although I knew it was occurring, I really didn't have a clear idea of how it was defined here and definitely had no idea the full extent of the work that was occurring. Very proud of Memorial's work thus far as well as the commitment to ongoing improvement.
- I'm not sure that I have a favorite part as I enjoyed all aspects. With the indigenous presentation, I really liked the different viewpoints and representation from management, faculty and learner. The wellness break-out room was very good. I also liked the updates by the panel at the end...they were very informative.
- Indigenization framework x5
- Indigenization Framework (plenary session) was excellent. The concurrent session, Social Accountability, was also very informative and generated much discussion.
- Indigenization session and social accountability

- Indigenous session. Open dialogue and positive approach. Keeping this issue on the forefront.
- John Jeddore. Honest guy. He told me something I should do, namely not ask indigenous people to fix colonial institutional problems
- Large group sessions
- Mentorship session.
- My favourite part was being able to participate. It has given me a better understanding of the roles in the FoM and what everyone has accomplished. It's amazing.
- Plenary session by Dr. Boluwaji Ogunyemi
- plenary
- Re-engaging with colleagues
- Research session
- Seeing everyone and listening to everyone's views
- Small group discussion regarding culture of excellence.
- The breakout concurrent session was lively with active discussion and contributions from many attendees.
- The breakout group discussion on Social Accountability- great discussion!
- The Concurrent session
- The COVID response overview allowed me to gain a better understanding of our current status and future directions
- The COVID update from the various deans. We are first and foremost the school so I think it's very important to highlight the endeavours of those groups and see how they overcame the challenges.
- The fantastic work done by the office of learner wellness and success
- The indigenization framework. Very useful and something I wanted to know.
- The initial portion...the Indigenous portion
- The interactions within all participates and presenters.
- The presentations regarding Indigenization
- The updates from the Associate Deans.
- Updates
- Wellness breakout session

How could the day have been improved?

- As previously mentioned. Maybe give out a healthy snack ideas/menu for people to make up at home. So we can all take part in a reasonable break in the middle. Ex yogurt with some oats or fruit. a few veggies dipped in hummus. In an email prior to the event. This way it is an experience. Or suggest to get up and walk out on the patio for a stretch mid-session. Just ideas to add to overall wellness.
- Comments above relating to concurrent sessions

- Diversity talk had too many slides and was rushed.
- I am wondering if in the Education session the speakers could have included representation from medical students and learners as well as graduate students. They could likely provide additional insights about the quality of the education experience from their perspective.
- I think everything went fairly smoothly. A lot of information delivered.
- I think it was well done and used the virtual platform extremely well.
- I think more time in the breakout rooms would have been helpful.
- I think the day was good. The planning seemed to meet the needs of the topics. Great to receive input on so many different levels.
- I would like to see more of the researcher points of view and resources available/to be made available in the future in these areas
- If this same method is used in the past, a longer time in concurrent sessions would be helpful for more meaningful discussion. It would also be helpful to post the questions asked in the session through screen share, just as a quick reminder.
- In person interaction.
- It was all fine
- It would have been much better in person, but we have no control over that right now. It's hard to have a fruitful discussion when everyone is online and people have to unmute and try to fit themselves into the conversation. I wish there were more opportunities for discussion. I think it also would have been better as a day-long event.
- Linking the plenary sessions explicitly to the Destination Excellence framework. While it was useful and efficient for the accreditation presentation to be done as it was, the Inclusivity talk was quite general and descriptive. (And I had heard much of it before.) I think we need to get past awareness raising of various areas and issues and on to mapping our progress more completely (even without metrics).
- Longer time devoted to breakout sessions perhaps by reduction of the number of topics and presentations
- Maybe a bit more time for open discussion, but there was so much great content being presented that I don't know that I would have changed much.
- Maybe a little more time devoted to the breakout sessions.
- Maybe breakouts or interaction in the longer sessions?
- Maybe could involve a mentor to explain how it's been for them. Lived experience is always value added.
- Maybe make it a little easier to get the link for the event by mailing it out.
- Minor technical difficulties, but those are almost always unavoidable.
- more clarification on the agenda for small groups - did it apply to students vs. staff vs faculty - should we break up staff from faculty from learners

- More learner representatives and call for input. Also an emphasis on transparency across all units during this difficult curriculum planning time.
- More small groups
- more time on discussion of the FoM strategic plan and teams - ability to have a brief update from all teams and not have to pick one session to attend
- More time for education panel presentations.
- not much- same issues with any virtual events. Tech and lack of networking. Maybe if virtual sessions continue, we can have social chats incorporated into the sessions in the breaks.
- Not sure it could have been improved, it was well organized and nearly flawless.
- Nothing at this point.
- One individual putting up presentations
- Perhaps a longer timeframe for the breakaway sessions-- it struck me that there was a much longer conversation waiting to happen!
- Perhaps this could have been adjusted in Webex, but I would have preferred to see the presenter more closely/clearly than other participants and/or have the presenters video appear in the corner of their slide show (perhaps we can already do this?)
- Tell me what to do with what you've learned from all the consultations
- The concurrent session was fine but it was difficult to have a discussion on the platform. Nobody's fault but it would have worked better in person. For virtual, it needed to have more focused questions.
- The opening remarks by Dr. Steele had some background noise. That was somewhat distracting.

Please add any additional comments you would like to give the organizers:

- Amazing job - these meetings need to happen more. It feels much more of a 'community' when all parties are given opportunity to highlight their work as well as congratulate others on their contributions
- As always- a very well organized event with great participation from everyone-- a very worthwhile Friday morning, for certain!
- Congratulations on a well-organized and productive event!
- Dr. Jeddore is an incredibly humble, well-respected clinician who was a great addition to the program and plenary
- Even though it is core to our ongoing existence, I did not see how the Accreditation session built towards Destination Excellence or work of the Project Teams. There was a certain irony to seeing it clearly mentioned how acronyms should not be used on a slide with multiple acronyms and easily two to four different acronyms jammed into every slide. I very much tuned out the accreditation section (in part due to the mass of unfamiliar acronyms)

- Excellent job Good idea breaking up into 2 half days
- First time attending. Enjoyed it.
- Great job (x7) - in a pandemic this should a lot of resilience in Medicine to keep moving ahead.
- I think it would be good to be kept up to date on how things are progressing.
- I think the session went very well given its delivery. I think this is something that can continue beyond the pandemic. It allows for more people to be able to participate without having to be in a particular location.
- I would have liked to see more staff attending. I know they were invited, however it looks like it was mostly management.
- My only suggestion is that during our current situation in particular, the agenda for the day should be included with the survey. I can only speak for myself but I find that with virtual sessions it is more difficult to remember certain details due to the diminishment (or non-existence) of sensory cues.
- Really liked being able to watch the presentations for the concurrent sessions ahead of time. Felt like that was way more efficient.
- Technically it went quite smoothly with minimal glitches - well done! I found it really helpful to get succinct, clear presentations around key points regarding Destination Excellence. The transparency and clear communication is very valuable.
- Thank You (x4). Glad to be a part of something besides my regular work. It is nice to change it up.
- This is truly a time for change. I think it is up to all of us to continue with this change in our work environment and to strive for something that works to the benefit of the university, the faculty, the staff and the learners.
- Very well organized (x2); with appropriate breaks and breakout sessions mid-way. Made for an easy "online" 1/2 day. Well done!



Faculty of Medicine
***Destination Excellence* Update and Planning Days**
Agenda
Friday, November 20, 2020
Via Webex

TIME	TOPIC	Facilitator(s)
8:45	Participants login	
9:00	Welcome and opening remarks	Dr. Margaret Steele
9:10 – 9:50	Plenary session – Memorial's Indigenization Strategy and Indigenization at the Faculty of Medicine in the context of <i>Destination Excellence</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Catharyn Andersen, Memorial's Special Advisor to the President on Indigenous Affairs (15 minutes) • Dr. Eric Smith, Mi'kmaw physician and Senior Regional Medical Officer of the Assembly of First Nations for Nova Scotia/Newfoundland and Labrador (10 minutes) • Dr. John Jeddore, post graduate resident, neurology, Eastern Health (10 minutes) 	
10:00 – 10:50	Concurrent break out sessions – (participants sign up in advance for the session they want to attend) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Social Accountability - Research - Wellness 	
11:00 – 11:50	Education panel – our response to Covid-19. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Tanis Adey, Undergraduate Medical Education • Dr. Sohaib Al-Asaaed, Postgraduate Medical Education • Dr. Ann Dorward, Research and Graduate Studies • Dr. Vernan Curan, Office of Professional and Educational Development • Dr. Greg Radu, Office of Learner Well-being and Success 	
11:50 – 12:00	Questions, Wrap up, Next steps	Dr. Margaret Steele



Friday, November 27, 2020
Via Webex

TIME	TOPIC	Facilitator(s)
12:45	Participants login	
1:00	Welcome and opening remarks	Dr. Margaret Steele
1:10 – 1:50	Plenary session – Inclusivity at the FoM and <i>Destination Excellence</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Bolu Ogunyemi 	
2:00 – 2:50	Concurrent breakout sessions (participants sign up in advance for the session they want to attend) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Balanced Score Card - Culture of Excellence - Mentorship 	
3:00 – 3:50	Education Excellence session: Undergraduate Medical Education Accreditation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Taryn Hearn, Chair, Accreditation Oversight Committee • Mr. Brian Kerr, Advisor, Curriculum and Accreditation 	
3:50 – 4:00	Questions, Wrap up, Next steps	Dr. Margaret Steele