

**UGMS Committee  
Minutes**

---

**DATE & TIME:** Wednesday, May 18, 2011, 4:00p.m.

**PLACE:** Professional Development and Conferencing Services Boardroom

**PRESENT:** G. Beckett (Acting Chair), S. Murphy, J. Farrell, J. McCarthy, E. Hillman, S. Pennell, J. McCarthy, J. Jackman, S. Moffatt, S. Mulay, S. Shah, B. Sussex, L. Gillespie, A. Goodridge

**ABSENT:** P. Richards, L. Glynn, M. Hogan, T. Adey

---

1. **Agenda** – Accepted. G. Beckett noted that the item on New policy standards would be deferred to the June meeting.
2. **Minutes of April 13, 2011** – Accepted
3. **Business Arising** – S. Murphy reported that the Phase Oversight Development Committee for the new curriculum was now active.

4. **Program Evaluation Sub-Committee Report**

A Goodridge presented an update from the PESC. A summary of his report is on the committee sharepoint site. Major points in his report and the discussion that followed included:

Response rates for student evaluations in the electronic environment has been a continuing problem.

A number of courses have been redesigned in recent years to deal with identified issues.

The evaluation performance of more courses is continuing to improve over recent years.

PESC workload continues to be heavy and problematic with the temporary loss of the PESC education specialist support staff member.

Performance in MCC Part 1 and 2 exams, NBME exams and Carms matching were reviewed.

Over time A. Goodridge felt that the problem areas in MCC Part I exam results tended to be in the the CLEO, Public Health and general Medicine areas of the exams. J. McCarthy identified MCC Part I performance as one of the issues being considered in the fourth year redesign process and stated that our benchmark should be to be in the top 50% of overall MCC Part I marks. It was also agreed that we should seek to improve overall performance in the MCC Part II exams.

Anatomy teaching program infrastructure support had been identified as an issue in the past and the Chair will follow up with the subject chair to see if sufficient resources are now in place to support this program.

Mandatory attendance for the palliative care component was raised as an issue. B. Sussex will raise this with the Pre-Clerkship Committee to review.

A Goodridge also identified that the Faculty Teaching Evaluations Policy had not been formally approved although it has been implemented in practice. The committee unanimously voted to approve the proposed policy statement.

L. Gillespies inquired about the tracking of faculty performance over time. A. Goodridge responded that PESC monitors evaluations and will investigate further if there is evidence of faculty teaching problems over time.

#### **5. Pre-Clerkship Examination Invigilation Policy**

The chair reviewed the clarifications that had been made in the invigilation policy which had been approved in principle at the April meeting. Further clarifications to be added included that: eating in exams could be permitted if there was a medical necessity to do so. challenge cards are available to students until they leave the exam area coats and bags brought to the exam room are to be placed in an area designated by the invigilator The chair will revised the policy document and arrange for distribution to all course chairs and the UGME Office.

#### **6. LCME Standard ED 35 Review**

There was discussion about ED 35 and how well our program matches the standard.

1.a – CanMeds mapping is taking place for the current curriculum as part of the MELT process for the new curriculum

1. b – a policy to update curriculum objectives is in place but is not necessarily effective. The work of PESC provides triggers when problems arise but a process is needed to have real and regular review of course content, teaching methods and objectives. While this work is being done for the new curriculum it was considered that it needed to be better done in the current curriculum and the process could be carried over to the new curriculum as it is introduced. Due to workload demands the point was made that the review should logically come from the course committees in pre-clerkship and rotation coordinators in clerkship.

1.c – The MELT process should satisfy this criteria

#### **7. Topics for Future Meetings**

- LCME Standards Review – ongoing
- New policy standards and reviews – H. Coombs-Thorne – June
- Fourth Year Reorganization Proposal – September
- UGMS Chairship - June

#### **8. Any Other Business**

S. Murphy identified that the Phase Development Oversight Committee needed one more faculty member from the UGMS Committee.

9. **Next Meeting** - The next meeting will be June 8, 2011 in the PDCS Boardroom.

10. **Adjournment** – The meeting adjourned at 5:35 PM