

FELLOWSHIP EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes of May 29, 2012 Meeting
8:00 AM to 9:30 AM – PGME Boardroom

Present:

Caroline Abrahams (PGME)	Dr. Cynthia Maxwell (Obstetrics & Gynaecology)
Dr. Glen Bandiera (PGME)	Loreta Muharuma (PGME)
Dr. Charles Catton (Radiation Oncology)	Dr. Benoit Mulsant (CAMH)
Jessica Fillion (PGME)	Dr. Rayfel Schneider (Paediatrics)
Dr. Jeannette Goguen (Medicine)	Shannon Spencer (Ex officio; UHN)
John Kerr (PGME)	Dr. Salvatore Spadafora (PGME)
Dr. Jonathan Kronick (SickKids)	Dr. David Wong (Ophthalmology)
Dr. David Latter (FEAC Chair; Surgery)	

Regrets:

Dr. Kaleem Ashraf (Clinical Fellow)	Dr. Brenda Toner (Psychiatry)
Dr. Karen Gómez Hernández (Clinical Fellow)	Dr. Roy Wyman (Family Medicine)

1. Introduction

Dr. Latter confirmed acceptance of the minutes of the FEAC meeting of February 28, 2012 and updated the committee on recent actions and events in follow up to that meeting.

- ***Royal College AFC (Diploma) Programs Update***
J. Kerr provided committee members with a table that recorded the current status of Royal College Areas of Focused Competence (Diploma) Programs. The most recent additions to the table were proposed diploma programs in Trauma Surgery and Aerospace Medicine. Both programs had entered the national consultation stage. Dr. Spadafora confirmed that, as Vice Dean PGME, he would be returning a collective UofT response to the Royal College by the deadline of June 29, 2012
- ***New CPSO Online Status Check Service***
J. Kerr reported that the CPSO had introduced an online status check service for applicants in April 2012. According to information provided to the PGME Office by applicants, the CPSO activates the service by providing applicants with a PIN and password once their application has been received and has entered the assessment stage. Applicants see their documents logged as “received” and the status of the documents revised to “assessed” once they have been assessed in good order. As the CPSO determines outstanding requirements, the applicant will notice “pending” documents which indicate that additional documentation is necessary or that documents which have been assessed were not in good order. Documents not in good order will also be accompanied by a note to the applicant for further clarification. When all required documentation has been received in good order and assessed, the applicant will receive an e-mail message from the CPSO with details of the certificate of registration.

The online status check service apparently does not include automatic e-mail alerts or reminders, however; applicants must revisit the website regularly in order to follow changes to their application status. Dr. Latter commented that the CPSO’s new online service seems to be a step towards the Online Appointment Tracking System (OATS) used by the Department of Surgery, as he had presented it to the CPSO during a meeting between the FEAC and the CPSO in November 2010.

J. Kerr confirmed that a meeting between representatives of the FEAC and the CPSO had been arranged for Thursday, September 11, 2012. During this meeting, the FEAC would present the findings of the *2012 Survey of University of Toronto Clinical Fellows*.

- ***PGME Communication of Initiatives for Clinical Fellows***

J. Filion confirmed that, further to the meeting of February 28, 2012, the PGME Office had issued separate e-mail announcements to all clinical fellows, to ensure their awareness of the Facebook forum for clinical fellows, the completion of training certificate for clinical fellows and the template educational objectives for clinical fellowship. J. Filion informed the FEAC that membership in the Facebook forum had now reached 221 fellows. J. Kerr gave the committee a preview of the newly updated and expanded orientation booklet for clinical fellows and confirmed that it would be electronically accessible through the PGME website by May 30, 2012. He added that hard copies of the booklet would be available in June and an e-mail announcement would follow.

2. Access to FEAC Minutes

To date, draft and approved minutes of FEAC meetings have appeared in a password-protected section of the FEAC website at <http://www.pgme.utoronto.ca/quickinfo/feac.htm>. Dr. Latter invited input from committee members on making approved minutes accessible without restriction. Dr. Mulsant supported wider accessibility as a means of increasing the impact of the committee's work. S. Spencer confirmed the usefulness, from a hospital perspective, of access to the minutes. Dr. Kronick suggested posting the minutes openly on the PGME Office website. Dr. Spadafora agreed with this suggestion and proposed that the posting of minutes be announced through a mass e-mailing by the PGME Office. Dr. Latter recorded committee approval of his motion, seconded by Dr. Spadafora, that minutes will be posted in a publicly accessible section of the FEAC website, beginning with the minutes of the meeting of May 29, 2012.

3. PGME Minimum Standards for In-Training Evaluation Reports (ITERs)

Dr. Latter directed the committee's attention to the *PGME Minimum Standards for Resident In-Training Evaluation Reports (ITERs)* that the Postgraduate Medical Education Advisory Committee (PGMEAC) had approved on April 27, 2012.

Dr. Bandiera affirmed that the intent of the new minimum standards was to help assessors focus on what really matters in the evaluation of trainees, to improve the quality of evaluation and assessment, as well as the completion rate of evaluations. He noted that a PGME study of completion rates on Teacher Effectiveness Scores had showed an inverse correlation between length of form and the rate of completion, with 6-10 ratings questions appearing to be the optimal length. A significant change, he remarked, was the requirement that all ratings questions be on a five-point scale with a rating of '3' or more representing a pass and less than a '3' being a clear 'fail'. This anchor for a pass rating was intended to resolve past issues involving borderline pass situations. Dr. Bandiera confirmed that the ratings principles were also applicable to fellowships. Dr. Latter strongly supported the requirement that all ITERs have one question which serves as the overall global performance question. Dr. Bandiera suggested that, going forward, the focus for departments would be on aligning new ITERs with the new minimum standards rather than attempting to apply the new standards retroactively.

4. Guidelines for Performance Assessment and Management of Deficiencies in Clinical Fellowships, Including Termination and Appeals: Results of Draft Review

At the February 28, 2012 meeting of the FEAC, a sub-group of the committee consisting of Dr. Maxwell, Dr. Gómez Hernández, S. Spencer, L. Muharuma, J. Kerr and Dr. Doreen Yee (Fellowship Program Director, Department of Anaesthesia) had distributed to committee members a draft document regarding guidelines for performance assessment and management of deficiencies in clinical fellowships. Another sub-group consisting of Dr. Latter, Dr. Bandiera, Dr. Goguen and Dr. Wong had subsequently reviewed the draft document and provided detailed suggestions for FEAC consideration.

The committee discussed the suggested revisions to the original draft in a detailed, line-by-line review of the documentation. There was unanimous support for Dr. Spadafora's identification of the document as a statement

of guidelines and not policy. J. Kerr agreed to produce a further copy of the document which would incorporate all of the changes accepted by the committee and to distribute this copy by e-mail to committee members for further input by e-mail before finalizing the draft document. L. Muharuma confirmed that the PGME Office would refer the final draft document to legal counsel for review prior to the next meeting of the FEAC.

5. 2012 Survey of University of Toronto Clinical Fellows: Remuneration Data

Further to her presentation of survey results at the February 28, 2012 meeting of the FEAC, C. Abrahams provided the committee with a sub-analysis of remuneration data from the *2012 Survey of University of Toronto Clinical Fellows*. She compared the findings of the survey with those of previous surveys in 2008 and 2010, examining the varied responses from Canadian citizens, Canadian permanent residents and visa trainees. Committee interest in these findings was sufficient to warrant distribution of the presentation slide deck to FEAC members after the meeting.

6. Next Steps

- a.) J. Kerr would revise and distribute by e-mail a clean copy of the draft guidelines document to committee members for further input. The PGME Office would arrange a review of the final draft by legal counsel prior to the next meeting of the FEAC, on October 2, 2012.
- b.) J. Kerr would distribute the slides on remuneration data to FEAC members.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 AM.