

UGMS Committee

Minutes

DATE & TIME: Wednesday, May 27, 2009 at 4:00 p.m.

PLACE: Professional Development and Conferencing Services Boardroom

PRESENT: Ms. L. Glynn (Chair), Drs. G. Farrell, S. Murphy, A. Goodridge, A. Dorward, C. Donovan, N. Bandrauk, M. Hogan, D. McKay, S. Moffatt, Ms. S. Ackerman, Ms. E. Hillman, Mr. G. Beckett, Mr. S. Pennell, Ms. M. Neary and Mr. N. Sowers (Student Representative)

APOLOGIES: Drs. S. Shah and T. Adey

Review of Minutes of March 25, 2009

Page 2, fifth paragraph, Dr. McKay noted that he does not recall agreeing to draft the parameters for a pilot project but he did advise that he is beginning to incorporate some of the changes into the courses for which he is the chair. At this time Dr. McKay outlined the process for which he is planning to introduce the spiral into the courses.

Dr. Farrell encouraged as many of the pilot projects as possible because he felt if there are going to be issues, they should be known as far in advance as possible so they can be dealt with before the new curriculum must be in place in 2012.

Ms. Glynn requested a report from everyone who is planning to run a pilot within their course. She also noted that before any planning was done in great detail, the MELT team should be contacted by the applicable course/component chair to ensure proper guidelines, etc. are followed.

The minutes of March 25 were approved.

New Business

Professionalism

Members were advised that there is currently an Ad Hoc Committee reviewing professionalism in the medical school. This is being done on a number of levels including where professionalism is taught, dealing with allegations of unprofessionalism, etc. The Ad Hoc Committee needs

volunteers before the end of June to answer some questions on behalf of this Committee. Drs. Bandrauk and Hogan volunteered.

Education During Hazard Policy

This item was removed from the agenda because it has already been approved by the Committee.

Withdrawal of the Unwell Student Policy

Ms. Neary was introduced to the Committee and, along with Dr. Moffatt, provided information on the policy. Background information on the policy was provided along with a short PowerPoint presentation. It was noted that the policy could come into effect for any of the following reasons:

- If the issue in question affects a student's ability to successfully complete the requirements of the academic program;
- If it puts the student at risk for illness progression if he/she continues in the program;
- If likelihood exists that the student's health or behavior could endanger the lives, health, or safety of the student or others.

Some members were concerned with regards to how differing opinions of the panel members would be dealt with and whether or not it would be appropriate to include the pre-clerkship and clerkship coordinators as members.

It was noted that the pre-clerkship and clerkship chairs are not members of the panel because they would be making the original recommendation. The associate dean's presence would be required after the original recommendation or if the student voluntarily withdraws, in order to help with the re-entry requirements through the pre-clerkship or clerkship chair and the wellness coordinator.

It was pointed out that there is currently a university policy on student withdrawals. Because the Unwell Student Policy will only be used in specific circumstances, it should be consistent with the withdrawal policy that currently exists. Additionally it was noted that the Professionalism Committee policies should also be consistent with this policy.

After some further discussion, the following points were noted:

- Should this policy refer to "with or without academic prejudice" for readmission?
- Should the student health check be conducted by a third party or someone who is already involved with the situation?
- Should the student representative be from the same class or should a student even be permitted to sit on the panel?
- Should the student in who is being asked to withdraw be permitted to present to the panel?
- Should there be very specific terms of reference regarding confidentiality?

Additional concern was expressed with regards to the appropriateness of a student being a member of the panel because this might give rise to privacy issues with regards to a student's health. It was pointed out that these are mature students and as such they should be responsible enough to respect the confidentiality as is appropriate to the profession. It was also noted that with regards to privacy, the Registrar's Office doesn't distinguish between medical and academic issues, and additionally student health issues sometimes come up in appeals and there are student representatives on that committee as well.

Mr. Sowers, as student representative on this Committee, agreed that students are being trained in a profession where confidentiality is a large part of student responsibility and also noted that for such positions, the student representative would be elected by his or her peers so it would be someone that the students would trust in such a position.

After some further discussion the Chair noted that there were a few amendments that would be required to the document which should be completed for discussion and voting at the next meeting. As well, terms of reference for the Student Health Advisory Team will also need to be developed.

Reports

Subcommittee for Student Assessment

Members were advised that this Committee had met the previous Monday at which time the report on assessment was reviewed and it was noted that approximately 8 to 10 recommendations had been approved with two awaiting further discussion. Additionally, the Committee is still working with D2L to improve ways to deal with assessment for MCQ and other types of assessment. A report will be presented to UGMS Committee at the June meeting.

The Committee was also advised by Dr. McKay that Senate had approved the new exam invigilation policy which will now be the guide document for this faculty.

Program Evaluations Subcommittee

Dr. Goodridge provided a copy of the report from the Program Evaluations Subcommittee which was reviewed.

After some discussion it was suggested that it may be a good idea to use the information from the Canadian Graduate Questionnaire when evaluating courses. The accreditors use this document so it may be a good idea for the faculty to use it as well.

It was also suggested that the possibility of rewarding faculty who have made very big changes might be considered; there are currently some faculty in this category.

Other Business**Faculty of Medicine Forum**

Members were advised that information on the forum has been sent to everyone and will also be posted on the home page. Dr. Peters and the MELT team will be presenting therefore all UGMS Committee members are expected to attend. The forum is scheduled for June 15.

Policy Monitoring Schedule

Ms. Glynn reminded members that at one point there had been someone on this Committee whose responsibility it was to track all policies, however this has not been done consistently during the past year. Ms. Glynn advised that she would be developing a log to implement this again on an ongoing basis. She and Ms. Moss will be responsible for tracking.

Next Meeting

Ms. Glynn advised that an additional meeting will be required and will be scheduled for June 24.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Ms. L. Glynn
Chair

/mjm