

## UGMS Committee

### Minutes

---

DATE & TIME: Wednesday, January 31, 2007 at 4:00 p.m.

PLACE: Boardroom #2, Professional Development and Conferencing Services

PRESENT: Dr. S. Peters (Chair), Drs. S. Moffatt, M. Wells, A. Goodridge, G. Farrell, D. McPhee, V. Gadag, C. Mann, S. Shah, D. Boone, Ms. S. Ackerman, Ms. E. Hillman, , Ms. D. Deacon, Ms. L. Glynn, Mr. G. Beckett, Mr. A. Kennedy (Student Representative) and Mr. C. Ryan (Student Representative)

APOLOGIES: Dr. A. Mohammed

---

#### Declaration of Conflict of Interest

No conflict of interest was declared.

#### Review of Minutes of January 10, 2007

It was noted that on page 4, the definition of borderline should be changed to read “a grade that has been given and deemed as a weak *performance*”.

The minutes were accepted as amended.

#### Policies and Procedures – PESC

#### **Course/Rotation Evaluation by Students**

It was noted that this evaluation is currently being completed by the students at the end of each rotation when they write their National Board examination and the return rate is very high. There are some concerns that the return rate will decrease once the evaluations are completed on the One45 system.

There was discussion regarding the best way to handle the possibility of a decreased return rate and concerns were expressed with regards to making completion mandatory and tying this to the release of grades. After much discussion, the following was decided:

- An information session will be provided to the pre-clerkship students now that One45 is available to them.
- Grades will “normally” be released when there is a 75% return rate or two weeks after the examination has been written; this does not make completion mandatory.
- Ms. Deacon will alert Ms. McEvoy of the UGME Office when the 75% return has been achieved so the grades can be released.

### **Program Effectiveness**

There was discussion regarding the parameters to be used by the Program Evaluations Subcommittee to look at the overall effect of the current undergraduate curriculum. Current measurements include the MCC and CaRMS results, the NMBE exam results, a graduate survey and location of practice. The policy will not be exclusive of other reports reflecting the quality and performance of our graduates.

In terms of the national board examination results, currently more than a year of statistics is available which could be reviewed as well to provide information gathered over a period of time for comparison purposes.

### **In-depth Course/Rotation Review**

It was noted that a memo has been developed to accompany the course review report, however, it should be addressed to the person who is responsible for the course and copied to UGME Committee Chair, Assistant Dean, UGME, and Clerkship Coordinator or Pre-Clerkship Coordinator instead of how it is currently addressed. The memo will indicate that a course/rotation review must be completed within the deadline and a template will also be provided for guidance.

At this point the template was reviewed and members were advised that the applicable course chair as well as the discipline chair/associate dean would be required to sign the form. It was also noted that all courses are expected to do a course review and provide a response. Courses that score lower would be advised of their deficiencies and they will be asked to review the areas identified and provide a response detailing how the concerns were addressed. The following year the course will be subject to an intense review to ensure the areas of concern were corrected.

Courses rated at a higher level will receive the review for their information.

After some further discussion, the following points were summarized:

- All subject/courses will be reviewed each year but there will be an in-depth review of those that score below 3.5.
- All subject/course chairs will be expected to respond to any identified concerns within 30 days of receipt of the their report using the provided template

- Those subjects/courses with an overall score of  $< 3.5$  will be required to complete a more in-depth review of their subject/course using the provided template and within 30 days. The response must be signed by the Committee Chair as well as the Discipline Chair or Associate Dean as applicable.
- In certain instances where specific areas only are below 3.5 the in-depth review may be required for those areas only.
- PESC will notify the UGMS Committee if there is an inadequate response or no response. A second letter will be sent from the UGMS Committee immediately requesting a response within two weeks. If again there is an inadequate response a letter will be sent to the Dean of Medicine and copied to the respective Discipline Chair or Associate Dean
- A letter of recognition will also be sent to courses that are doing well.
- PESC has also decided that if a course score decreases by more than 1.5 from the previous review, the course chair would be approached to address these concerns.

### **Resident Teaching**

Members were reminded that a policy has already been passed regarding resident teaching of medical students and in this policy there was reference to professional development. Members were asked if they felt the statement should read that it was mandatory that professional development start at the beginning of postgraduate training and continue throughout, however it should be considered that if this is to be the case, it must be ensured that the training can be provided.

It was noted that there are currently mandatory conferences in place on communication skills for PGY-1 residents but the attendance rate is only at 37% and as well, there are trends towards specific disciplines to have good or poor attendance.

After some discussion it was felt that the current documentation would not require revision because it satisfies the requirements. It was felt however, that an addition should be made to the policy stating that it is an expectation that within two years all postgraduate trainees will have undertaken some form of teaching effectiveness training.

### **Curriculum Review**

It was noted that a curriculum review process was put in place by the past committee however, it has not been completed. Circumstances are now such that a total curriculum renewal is probably more appropriate. One suggestion was that a task force be formed to do an in-depth review with the possibility of creating a new curriculum. Consideration should also be given to the possibility of presenting a new structure to faculty council in the next year.

Members were advised that the recent retreat provided valuable information with regards to changes needed. PESC could also be approached to do an overall review of available information make some recommendations about approach. Information can be gathered on internal capacities as well as on the number of teaching hours devoted to lectures and to small group teaching, etc. since the last major curriculum change in 1998.

Drs. Wells, Farrell, Goodridge, Boone, Ms. Ackerman, Ms. Deacon and Mr. Beckett were appointed to develop a report that will summarize all of the available information to present the UGMS Committee

At this time Dr. Goodridge noted that PESC is very active and the committee requires more hands on than first anticipated with regards to making policies and ensuring these policies are acted upon.

#### Inter-Professional Education Curriculum Objectives

Dr. Boone advised that these objectives had been presented by Dr. Curran at the last Clerkship Committee meeting and at that time the request was made for formal adoption. It was suggested that Dr. Curran should present these objectives to UGMS as well. There was some confusion with regards to exactly how the clerkship disciplines were supposed to apply these objectives to their curriculum.

It was felt that this was not currently a pressing issue and it was agreed that this could be tabled until after accreditation. Dr. Curran would be asked to provide, in writing, his vision of the operational activity on how these objectives are to be used in clerkship.

It is noted that Dr. Curran was confused as to where the meeting was held and came as the meeting was adjourned. He has been asked to return in April with additional information

#### Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 pm

S. Peters, MD, FRCPC  
Interim Chair, UGMS

/mjm