

UGMS Committee

Minutes

DATE & TIME: Wednesday, July 15, 2009 at 4:00 p.m.

PLACE: Professional Development and Conferencing Services Boardroom

PRESENT: Ms. L. Glynn (Chair), Drs. C. Donovan, S. Murphy, N. Bandrauk, A. Goodridge, S. Shah, D. McKay, A. Dorward, G. Farrell, D. Boone, T. Adey, Ms. S. Ackerman, Ms. E. Hillman, Mr. J. Thorburn (Student Representative) and Mr. N. Sowers (Student Representative)

APOLOGIES: Dr. S. Moffatt, Mr. G. Beckett and Mr. S. Pennell

Review of Minutes of June 24, 2009

The minutes were unavailable for approval at this time.

Professionalism

Dr. Farrell advised that work was still being done on the draft document with regards to what professionalism means. It was felt that the document should not use a prescriptive list and therefore, a review of the Canadian Medical Association's Code of Ethics is being conducted. Other issues being looked at include how a breach of conduct would be recorded, the membership of the Review Committee and the process that would require the committee to respond in a timely manner and to determine if a breach of conduct did indeed take place. If the occurrence is something the person did not realize was happening it would not be considered as deliberate and could be dealt with in an informal manner. If the conduct in question is a pattern behavior or more substantive, the Review Committee would make recommendations to the Promotions Committee. All documentation will be handled in the UGME Office.

It was noted that the document refers to faculty as well as students. The medical school should be prepared to deal with faculty issues when a student questions professionalism.

Some members felt that in the case of a student expressing concerns about faculty, it should be referred to the Office of Student Affairs (if they agree) who can then advise of the proper procedure for the student to follow. This procedure would depend on whether or not the faculty in question are members of MUNFA. There may also be issues with regards to a promise of anonymity and due process as this could only be done to a limited point which might be at the level at which the Review Committee feels there is a problem. A court of law would probably not allow the continuation of anonymity if the matter is no longer in the hands of the medical school.

After further discussion it was felt that the final paragraph under the heading of "Procedure" should be removed. Additionally, Dr. McKay agreed to forward to Dr. Farrell, the edits and suggestions that he felt were appropriate for the revised document. Dr. Bandrauk and Dr. Farrell will make the changes as noted by the Committee and bring it to the next meeting for further review.

Members also wondered what would happen after the referral for assessment and also how the maintenance of a file of reports would be handled. Dr. Farrell advised that the statements in the document were deliberately vague in order to get input from this Committee with regards to what it should be. He also felt that such reports should not be shredded.

Discussion continued and it was felt that further information regarding this should be sought, possibly from the University Privacy Office.

Ms. Glynn asked that this document be updated and posted on the home page as soon as possible so it can be reviewed and presented at Faculty Council in September.

Invigilation

Dr. McKay advised members that the University wide policy was passed at Senate in May. He felt that until there is a reason demonstrated that the University policy is not working for the medical school, this Committee should accept the document as it currently is. The Assessment Committee will meet in September and will review the document and decide what to apply to the medical school and what should be changed.

Members agreed to refer this document to the Assessment Committee for further comments and also agreed to follow the guidelines on page one of the University policy.

Withdrawal of the Unwell Student Policy

Members were advised that Dr. Moffatt was unable to attend today's meeting and had requested that this discussion should be deferred to the September meeting.

MELT

Drs. Peters and Hansen were present as representatives of MELT.

Ms. Glynn advised that the Committee had expressed concerns about having a new curriculum that would need to be implemented quickly as opposed to taking a longer period of time to do this. In light of this, members would like input from MELT representatives regarding the possibility of developing a pilot in the first semester of the first year course Basic Science of Medicine I.

Dr. Hansen noted this would correspond to phase one of the new curriculum and she advised that she would be happy to work with people on this.

There was concern expressed with regards to whether or not a pilot would be ready in time to be incorporated into the curriculum for September 2010 and it was suggested that it be done informally for 2010 and formally for 2011. Drs. Hansen and Peters felt that this would be okay.

Dr. McKay discussed possible ways that this could be accomplished including the possibility of introducing CanMeds roles earlier and ensuring that all areas are coordinated appropriately with clinical skills.

Dr. Peters stated that this could be done under the current system without Faculty Council approval. As well, consideration could also be given to introducing the academic ½ day now which could be designed to allow some of the things that are currently being considered. There may be some objectives available for September 2010 if the ½ day were to be introduced at that time. Some of the cases may also be available at the same time.

Dr. Hansen noted that at the end of this year the skeleton case may also be available which will provide a set of scenarios of healthy patients going to their family physician. This would also be helpful for what is being planned. Additionally, clinical skills could now begin to look at ways to incorporate concepts that will come about in the new curriculum.

Dr. Peters advised that content delivery should be discussed with the associate dean as this Committee is meant to deal with governance matters only. This group should review the terms of reference as they currently are written for the UGMS Committee and a small working group should be established to review this through the mirror of good governance.

Dr. McKay indicated that guidelines were needed with regards to how assessment will work and how much teaching time will be required by faculty, etc.

Dr. Hansen advised that the Medical Education ??? Centre (MESCC) is staffed by professional people who could assist in planning and assessment to ensure what is being considered will be valid. As chair of the Assessment Committee, Dr. McKay can meet with some key people and then meet with the MELT team for discussion. This could then be used as a model for how the process should be implemented.

Ms. Glynn thanked Drs. Peters and Hansen for attending the meeting and providing the information as requested and felt that a lot of questions had been answered with regards to governance and management issues.

Dr. Hansen stated that MELT would like feedback on the discussion assessment for pedagogy.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

L. Glynn
Chair

/mjm