COMPETENCY COMMITTEE
TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. ESTABLISHMENT

The Undergraduate Medical Education Committee (**UMEC**) hereby establishes a special committee called the Competency Committee.

2. JUSTIFICATION

Competence is a convoluted construct that requires sufficient knowledge, skills, and attitudes to consistently perform a variety of roles/activities at an appropriate level in diverse learning and clinical contexts. Given the complexity of this construct, there is no single assessment tool that can be used to infer competence. Instead, we need a variety of tools to assess different aspects of competence that, depending upon the tool, may best be described using words, numbers, or rating scales. Also, in order to provide a consistent measure, these assessments should be performed repeatedly over a sufficiently long period of time.

Since there is no easy way to combine repeated measures of knowledge, skills, and attitudes (expressed as words, numbers, or ratings on a scale) into a single measure, decisions on whether students are ready to progress to their next stage of training or be promoted to graduation are made by a Competency Committee. This committee considers quantitative and qualitative data from all summative assessments over the training timeline, including how performance changes over time, whether mentoring is completed, and performance on any retake assessments. Based upon consideration of all these data, the Competency Committee makes consensus recommendations to the Associated Dean regarding each student's readiness to progress to their next stage of training with or without the need to complete remediation of any part of the prior curriculum.

3. ROLE and RESPONSIBILITIES

The role of the Competency Committee is to make progression and graduation recommendations for students in the Undergraduate Medical Education (**UME**) program at the Cumming School of Medicine (CSM) to the Associate Dean.

The Competency Committee reports to UMEC. For a student to be recommended for promotion or graduation, this must be the recommendation of the Competency Committee who, having considered the relevant and available information, believe that this student is meeting the standards of the program.

4. DUTIES

The Competency Committee will fulfill its role primarily by carrying out the duties enumerated below. The listed duties shall be the common, recurring activities of the Competency Committee; however, the Competency Committee may carry out such additional duties as are necessary or appropriate for the performance of its role. The Competency Committee's primary duties are as follows:

A. Preclerkship (Year 1 & 2)

The Competency Committee will meet every 6 months during the pre-clerkship curriculum and review the academic progression of all students in the preclerkship curriculum.

Information reviewed at each meeting includes:

Timeline 1 (July – December of Year 1): Professional Role and Fundamentals of Medicine 1-4
Timeline 2 (January- June of Year 1): Professional Role and Fundamentals of Medicine 5-8
Timeline 3 (July – December of Year 2): Professional Role and Fundamentals of Medicine 9-12

Process for academic review is as follows:

At the committee meeting, all students will be reviewed and a recommendation will be made to the Associate Dean regarding progression in the preclerkship curriculum. At each meeting the committee will:

1. Receive recommendations by the UME Assistant Dean of Evaluation & Research, and/or UME Assistant Dean, Program Evaluation and/or Director, Preclerkship Assessment on student readiness to progress to the next block in preclerkship.
    a. Recommendations will be based on standardized reports of assessment data prepared by the UME Manager of Academic Technologies.
    b. The UME Assistant Dean of Evaluation & Research, UME Assistant Dean, Program Evaluation and Director, Preclerkship Assessment will review all reports in detail for performance in the Cumming School of Medicine UME Program objectives and present recommendations to the Competency Committee.

2. Review recommendations in detail and discuss student readiness for progression.
    a. For students who have scored above the minimum pass level on all summative examinations and the Objective Structured Clinical Exam (**OSCE**), and have not demonstrated a pattern of concerns questioning their competency in any area of the CSM UME Program objectives, data will be presented in aggregate, and a single vote will be held. Student reports will be available if requested, and if the Competency Committee requests to vote on individual students from this cohort (separate from the combined vote), this will be granted.
    b. For students who meet any of the following criteria, the UME Assistant Dean, Evaluations and Research (or designate) will present qualitative and quantitative data for each student individually, or in aggregate with other students with similar outcome data, and the Competency Committee will vote on each student, or group of students, separately:
        i. Received one or more unsatisfactory overall course evaluations;
        ii. Scored unsatisfactory on one or more final examinations;
        iii. Scored unsatisfactory on the OSCE;

       iv.   Been flagged for professionalism during pre-clerkship; or

       v.   Demonstrated a pattern of concerns questioning their competency in any area of the CSM UME objectives.

3. Vote to recommend to the Associate Dean which students have met all the requirements in the current block of the program and are ready for progression to the next block in preclerkship.

4. Vote to recommend to the Associate Dean which students have NOT met all the requirements in the current block and a remedial plan is required.

5. An electronic meeting will occur to fully promote students to the next level of the program once remedial work has been successfully completed.

Recommendations could include:

1. Students who are deemed satisfactory overall will proceed to the next block without the need for remediation.
2. Students who are deemed satisfactory with performance deficiencies will be proceed to the next block but with a requirement to complete remedial work, as per the judgement of the Review Director.
3. Students who are deemed unsatisfactory overall will not proceed to the next unit, and will be required to present to the SARC.

Clerkship (Year 3)

The Competency Committee will meet two times per year during the clerkship curriculum and review the academic progression of all students for graduation.

Information reviewed at this meeting includes all rotational and elective documentation to date from the clerkship year.

At the committee meeting, all students will be reviewed and a recommendation will be made to the Associate Dean regarding graduation from the Medical Doctor Program

Process for academic review is as follows:

6. Receive recommendations by the UME Assistant Dean of Evaluation & Research and the UME Assistant Dean, Program Evaluation on student progress in the clerkship, and/or readiness to graduate.
    a. Recommendations will be based on standardized reports of assessment data prepared by the UME Manager of Academic Technologies.
    b. The UME Assistant Dean of Evaluation & Research and the UME Assistant Dean, Program Evaluation will review all reports in detail for performance in the CSM UME Objectives. The UME Assistant Dean, Program Evaluation (or designate) will present recommendations to the Competency Committee.

7. Review recommendations in detail and discuss student readiness for graduation.
    a. For students who have passed all final clerkship In Training Evaluation Report (**ITERs**), scored above the minimum pass level on all summative examinations and the clerkship Objective Structured Clinical Exam (**OSCE**), and have not demonstrated a pattern of concerns questioning their competency in any of the CSM UME Objectives, data will be presented in aggregate, and a single vote will be held. Student reports will be available if requested, and if the Competency Committee requests to vote on individual students from this cohort (separate from the combined vote), this will be granted.
    b. For students who meet any of the following criteria, the UME Assistant Dean, Evaluation and Research (or designate) will present qualitative and quantitative data for each student individually, or in aggregate with other students with similar outcome data, and the Competency Committee will vote on each student, or group of students, separately:
        i. received one or more unsatisfactory final ITERs;
        ii. scored unsatisfactory on one or more final examinations;
        iii. scored unsatisfactory on the clerkship OSCE;
        iv. has additional remaining uncompleted clerkship weeks or examinations relative to their graduating class at the time of the committee meeting (such as in the case of outstanding deferred or remedial work);
        v. has been flagged for professionalism or patient safety concerns during clerkship; or
        vi. has demonstrated a pattern of concerns questioning their competency in any of the CSM UME Objectives.

8. Vote to recommend to the Associate Dean which students have met the graduation standards of the CSM Medical Doctor (MD) program and are ready for graduation.

9. Vote to recommend to the Associate Dean which students have NOT met the graduation standards of the CSM MD program and are not ready for graduation.

10. For students where consensus is not possible, the Competency Committee will request additional data and reconvene and discuss these students in more detail.
    a. The committee can request any and all information from the student's file that is deemed necessary to make a decision.
    b. The Assistant Dean of Evaluations & Research and the Assistant Dean, Program Evaluation will collect this data and present a summary of this data and an updated recommendation to the committee at a future meeting.

11. At the second meeting, the committee will review recommendations in detail and again discuss student readiness for graduation.
    a. The Assistant Dean of Evaluation & Research and the Assistant Dean, Program Evaluation will present requested data to the committee and give a recommendation on graduation readiness.
    b. The committee will again vote to recommend to the Associate Dean which students have and have not met the graduation standards of the CSM MD Program. If consensus is reached, the committee will make a recommendation to the Associate Dean on the students' readiness for graduation.

12. When a consensus decision is unable to be reached (even after the committee reviews additional requested information), AND, for those students whom the committee agrees are not ready for graduation, the

Associate Dean will refer these students to the Student Academic Review Committee (**SARC**) for individual recommendations. A summary of the committee's concerns will be provided to the SARC.

5. DECISION TIMELINES

Recommendations of the competency committee will be communicated to the Associate Dean in writing at the conclusion of each meeting. The Associate Dean's final decisions will then be communicated to students through the Manager of Curriculum (or designate), generally within 48 hours of the conclusion of the meeting.

6. MEMBERSHIP

PRECLERKSHIP

Chair:	Dr. Kevin McLaughlin
UME, Associate Dean:	Dr. Christopher Naugler (*1 vote*)
UME Clerkship, Assistant Dean:	Dr. Kevin Busche (*1 vote*)
UME Pre-Clerkship, Assistant Dean:	Dr. Sarah Weeks (*1 vote*)
Clinical Member:	Dr. Daniel Miller (*1 vote*)
Student advising and wellness representative:	Dr. Teresa Killam (*1 vote*)
Curriculum Manager[2]	Sue-Ann Facchini

CLERKSHIP

Chair:	Dr. Kevin McLaughlin
CSM, Senior Associate Dean Representative	Dr. Lisa Welikovitch (*1 vote*)
UME, Associate Dean:	Dr. Christopher Naugler (*1 vote*)
UME Clerkship, Assistant Dean:	Dr. Kevin Busche (*1 vote*)
UME Pre-Clerkship, Assistant Dean:	Dr. Sarah Weeks (*1 vote*)
Postgraduate Medical Education, Representative:	Dr. Melinda Davis (*1 vote*)
Student Evaluation Committee (**SEC**), Representative:	Dr. Harish Amin (*1 vote*)
SARC, Previous Member:	Dr. Gregg Nelson (*1 vote*)
Clinical Member:	Dr. Daniel Miller (*1 vote*)
Member of the Public[2]:	Bonnie Vogeli
UME Representatives[2]:	Shannon Leskosky Mike Paget

---

[2] Non-voting member(s).
Voting members can designate an alternate

Student Representative[2]:

Committee Presenters[2]:   Dr. Janeve Desy
                                                     Dr. Adrian Harvey

Administrative Support[2]:   Jane McNeill

7. MEETINGS

Meetings will be held at the discretion of the Competency Committee Chair with proper notice to the Members.

8. QUORUM

Quorum will consist of three of the voting members for preclerkship competency committee and five of the voting members for clerkship competency committee.

9. VOTING PROCESS

Decisions will be guided by principles and factors that ensure students who are promoted or graduate meet the required competencies of a Cumming School of Medicine (CSM) medical school graduate. The Competency Committee will follow a consensus decision-making process with a decision rule based upon unanimity. This process begins by the Assistant Dean, Evaluation and Research (or designate) discussing the performance of each student (or students) and then making a proposal to promote/graduate or not based upon the student's perceived readiness. In order to mitigate risk of bias that may arise from prior knowledge of the student - or biases, such as stereotyping that could arise from simply knowing demographic information - all students are referred to using their student identification number rather than using their name or a gender pronoun. Following the proposal, the Competency Committee will discuss the recommendations. The Competency Committee will then vote to determine if consensus has been reached. Members can vote to either agree with the recommendation, disagree with the recommendation, raise concerns about the recommendation, or block the decision regarding graduation of this student. Possible outcomes include (reference Appendix A for further detail regarding this process):

1) Consensus is achieved: this decision is then implemented.
2) Consensus is not achieved.
    a. If consensus is not achieved due to concerns, each dissenting member discusses their concerns and presents a revised proposal.
        i. This process continues until there is either consensus among all voting members, dissenting members step aside in order for a proposal to be passed and implemented, or a voting member blocks the decision.

Consensus is blocked by a blocking vote. Any voting member can block a proposal. If one or more voting members blocks a proposal then the committee must request additional information about the student in question, and rediscuss the student at a future meeting. If a voting member blocks a proposal at the second meeting, the committee makes a recommendation for the student to be presented at the SARC.

10. EFFECTIVE DATE

These Terms of Reference will be effective on the date that they are approved by the UMEC.

Approved by the UMEC: May 26, 2023
Approved by the SEC: April 15, 2020
Reviewed & Updated: May 26, 2023

Appendix A: Competency Committee Voting Process

Director of Student Evaluations (or designate) discusses student's performance assessments

→

Director of Student Evaluations (or designate) proposes decision to graduate or not

→

Test for consensus among voting members

Concerns

Dissenting member discusses and presents revised proposal

Consensus not possible due to blocking vote(s)* or consensus to not graduate

Consensus to graduate (unanimous or with step aside(s))

Recommend to the Associate Dean to refer to SARC**

Recommend to the Associate Dean to graduate student

*If consensus not possible at first meeting: committee requests additional information and reconvenes
**Committee's concerns will be provided to SARC