

UGMS Committee

CONFIDENTIAL

Minutes

---

DATE & TIME: Monday, November 6, 2006 at 4:00pm

PLACE: Undergraduate Medical Education Boardroom

PRESENT: Drs. S. Peters, G. Farrell, D. MacPhee, A. Mohammed, V. Gadag, Ms. S. Ackerman, Ms. E. Hillman, Mr. G. Beckett, Ms. L. Glynn, Mr. A. Ackerman (Student Representative), Ms. C. Walsh (invited guest)

APOLOGIES: Drs. S. Moffatt, M. Wells, Ms. M. Moss

---

While waiting for a quorum, Dr. S. Peters briefly noted the following:

- G. Beckett would take demonstrate SharePoint near the end of the meeting.
- Add “LCME Standards As They Change” to the agenda
- Dr. G. Farrell and G. Beckett reported that more objectives have been received and added to the database. Course chairs for outstanding objectives have been notified accordingly.

Declaration of Conflict of Interest

Dr. S. Peters advised committee members that it is up to committee members to identify if they are in a conflict of interest with agenda items.

Previous Minutes and Review

Minutes of the October 23, 2006 meeting were adopted by consensus.

IT Discussion Paper

Ms. C. Walsh was welcomed by Dr. S. Peters and was asked to summarize her discussion paper, “Information Technology and Curriculum Delivery in the Undergraduate Medical Education Program”. The following was highlighted:

- the focus of the paper was on the current use of technology in curriculum delivery and the identification of potential opportunities that we may be missing in terms of teaching, learning, and evaluation.
- the rationale for developing the paper was to outline how we can be proactive rather than reactive in technological adoption and utilization, to critically evaluate what we are doing, to plan for the future, and to set processes for ongoing review and implementation
- the paper, tho written less than a year ago, is already out of date regarding several technologies (i.e. online self-assessments, T-Res, One45, WebCT, etc).
- technology / informatics must be integrated based on identified needs of faculty, students studying remotely, the curriculum, etc.

- Ms. Walsh recommended the creation of a database of meta-tagged resources (images, documents, presentations, other learning objects, etc.) to be shared across the curriculum. This will eliminate content and resource duplication.
- Ms. Walsh recommended the creation of an Informatics Committee to help with technological integration into the curriculum. Such a committee would work with students and faculty and its focus would stretch beyond web education.
- It is important to look closely at current workflow processes which use technology to get resources to students, and standardize such processes (i.e. faculty develops content → send content to HSIMS to put up on learning management system → send to printing services when necessary, etc.). These processes / user guidelines should ideally be standardized for all applicable individuals including course chairs, preceptors, etc.
- Technology can be used to promote more user-centered, self-directed learning for students.
- Information literacy skills should be integrated into the curriculum to teach students how to identify and use appropriate informational technologies for different informational needs.

Ms. L. Glynn responded to Ms. Walsh's paper. She thanked Ms. Walsh for taking the time to present her paper to the committee and commended her on a thorough and informative look at our current technological environment. She noted the following observations:

- UGMS obviously has an interest in adopting and utilising new technologies for curriculum delivery and clinical enhancement. However, it appears that this trend is piecemeal thus resulting in a lack of defined informatics objectives, poor implementation and training, and limitations in utility.
- The paper presents two major issues that need to be addressed: what technologies are required to enhance teaching, learning, organization, evaluation, etc., and what are the core technological / informatics competencies that students should obtain while in UGME?
- In order to effectively incorporate appropriate technologies, an Informatics Committee must be formed. This committee would ideally identify the roles that technology can play in the curriculum, define objectives, and coordinate curriculum integration, evaluation and training.

The floor was open for discussion.

Dr. MacPhee asked whether T-Res duplicated WebCT functionality. Mr. G. Beckett indicated that while there was overlap, WebCT is essentially a course management system and that T-Res is designed specifically for evaluation and scheduling. Options are being investigated for one resource that can effectively address these functions. Mr. Beckett noted that an RFP for a new LMS (Learning Management System) for the Faculty of Medicine has been released, and that the possibility exists for the Faculty of Medicine to adopt its own LMS outside of MUN's official adoption of WebCT.

It was asked whether or not IVIMeds is now accessible. Mr. Beckett indicated that some modules have been developed and can be used (i.e. cardiovascular virtual patient). Dr. Farrell noted that there are no standard interface guidelines developed yet and it is not ready for commercial use at this point.

Mr. Beckett reiterated that advances in the adoption of technology has been ad-hoc and voluntary thus far and that a more formalized approach is necessary. Dr. Farrell stressed that expectations must be clearly made to students and faculty in advance as to what direction UGME is heading in terms of technological adoption.

Dr. S. Peters identified the need for a working group to create terms of reference for a SubCommittee. The Working Group consists of Dr. D. MacPhee, Dr. G. Farrell, Mr. G. Beckett and Ms. L. Glynn. They will report to the UGMS Committee at the December 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### Policies and Procedures

All policies and procedures for UGME will be posted on the Faculty of Medicine's website and will follow the same template. Dr. S. Peters is working on these policies and procedures. Two of these documents were discussed:

*Formative Assessment.* Discussion of the document indicated that more precise wording was necessary to avoid any possible misinterpretation. Resulting revisions to the document include the following:

- Responsibility for adherence lies with the pre-clerkship and clerkship coordinators
- Formative assessment is mandatory and counts for 5% of the summative evaluation in a subject/course/rotation.

*Standards for Promotion.* Discussion of the document indicated that more precise wording was necessary to avoid any possible misinterpretation. Resulting revisions to the document include the following:

- Add to definition that “borderline” students undergo remediation and that “fail” students undergo reassessment
- Add “ITER” to definitions
- “Borderline” must be defined

Discussion ensued regarding the timing and scheduling of ITER repeats. The question was raised as to how to treat the clerk who is “self-destructing”; who is so stressed that her/his judgement is impaired and patient safety is at risk. Recognising that this is a non-academic decision, a safety policy for necessary intervention must be created. Dr. S. Peters will investigate this and report back at the next meeting.

*Course/Clerkship Evaluation Policy.* This document is the first of a series of documents from PESC.

Mr. Beckett demonstrated SharePoint, which is a pre-packaged program designed to facilitate committee needs. The program allows committee members to view, print, and attach documents, list agenda items, join discussion threads, contact members, make and receive announcements, set up email alerts, etc. Dr. S. Peters noted that it is also a quick method to approve minutes and vote on non-sensitive matters. All attendees were

impressed with the program. Mr. George Beckett will work with Ms. M. Moss on the UGMS SharePoint site.

Deferred: Lecture Room Utilization

Meeting adjourned at 5:30.