Clerkship Committee (CC)

January 21, 2020
12:30 – 2:30 PM
FMC, HSC, G750


Guests: Dr. A. Harvey, and K. Chadbolt, C. Wong.

1. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 12:30 PM by K. Busche (Chair). K. Busche thanked everyone for coming and the committee members introduced themselves to the new members and the committee guests.

2. Approval of Meeting Agenda
Adjustments to the meeting agenda’s planned order were proposed: item 7.9 “iClickers” was moved to occur immediately following the approval of the agenda. K. Busche asked for a motion for the Committee to accept the agenda with the proposed updates.

MOTION: Moved by – S. Weeks / Seconded by – J. Haws
That the Clerkship Committee approve the Meeting Agenda, with the proposed amendments, for the Clerkship Committee’s Meeting for January 21, 2020.
CARRIED

3. New Business – Voting iClickers
K. Busche discussed a proposal for the committee to utilize anonymous voting using iClicker technology for committee meetings moving forward. K. Busche mentioned M. Paget and Academic Technologies would help the committee to run the technology, if the proposal was accepted. The committee had a discussion around how voting members attending via the phone would still be able to vote by texting or emailing their vote to the meeting admin or another proxy. The committee agreed the Chair’s vote would not be anonymous, as they only vote in case of a tie. C. Naugler inquired the criteria for what the iClickers would be used to vote for. K. Busche proposed that the iClickers be used for all votes in order to avoid having to decide in the moment of a vote what criteria should be used.

MOTION: Moved by – G. Gelfand / Seconded by – S. Wicklum
That the Clerkship Committee use voting clickers when voting moving forward.
CARRIED

4. Arising from the Minutes
K. Busche proceeded to the “Arising from the Minutes” portion of the agenda.
4.1 Clerkship Template Presentation to Committee
The committee had a discussion around templates for clerkship reports to the committee. It was concluded that most members put their own PowerPoint presentations together and a template would not be needed.

4.2 Budget Update
K. Busche tabled the “Budget Update” agenda item until committee guest K. Chadbolt arrived to present the update.

4.3 Clerkship Handbook
K. Busche thanked everyone for their hard work on updating the “Clerkship Student Handbook: Class of 2021”. K. Busche recognized S. Tai for all of her work updating the handbook, and student Clerks who had gone over the document in great detail.

4.4 IM OSCE
K. Busche gave an update to the committee that there would be significant budget issues if the IM OSCE was run multiple times, and from a scheduling point of view it was not going to work. K. Busche mentioned that IM would not be running their OSCE for the coming year. K. Busche mentioned he was not exactly sure what could take the IM OSCE place, but that preliminary discussions have begun to see if something could be done for this year’s class to have a formative clerkship OSCE and keep some of the good elements going.

5. Clerkship Reports
K. Busche invited S. Wicklum to deliver the Family Medicine clerkship report to the committee.

5.1 Family Medicine Clerkship Report
S. Wicklum delivered the Family Medicine Clerkship report to the Committee. S. Wicklum thanked C. Wong for all of her hard work, despite only coming into the role this year.

S. Wicklum mentioned that communicating to preceptors is one of this clerkship’s biggest challenges – to address that, a preceptor manual that is well rounded and covers all the bases has been worked on. S. Wicklum mentioned that events run by the Clerkship are very successful and well attended.

Speaking to a concern from last year that there is not enough didactic teaching in the Clerkship – S. Wicklum mentioned that new brief educational sessions developed by the Clerks have been added – most students chose to develop infographics which were posted on the Family Medicine information board. S. Wicklum went over identified opportunities to collaborate with “Learn FM”, including meshing the developed infographics onto the site, as it is one of the only open source resources for family medicine in the world.

S. Wicklum mentioned how this year rural sites were divided into zones, so those students who desired a zone close to Calgary could choose sites closer to Calgary, and a large percentage did. S. Wicklum mentioned that all the clerks (class 2021 onward) are going out to receive rural learning exposure, except those with exceptionally good reasons to have exemptions. S. Wicklum mentioned the Clerkship has a strong core of preceptors, and an area of growth is sorting out those in the periphery (rural sites): how they are doing, and how they can be better supported.

S. Wicklum mentioned that the clerkship’s learning objectives are fully mapped onto the exam book, logbook, and Clerkship Manual – cleaning it up for next year is on the agenda.

S. Wicklum mentioned that most students in both urban and rural sites spend time on an inter-disciplinary team with exposure to working with a dietician, nurse etc. – but learners are sometimes alone in the clinic with their preceptor, so also receiving 1-on-1 learning.

S. Wicklum mentioned there is there is the rare instance that fatigue of learners becomes an issue, she uses this as an opportunity to remind and regroup the preceptor to not work the students too hard, as they have
other responsibilities on top of their clinic time. S. Wicklum mentioned they are using systems from UME’s Academic Technologies team to recruit preceptors, including being able to recruit one preceptor recently that was urgently needed.

K. Busche thanked S. Wicklum for the report and inquired if anyone on the committee had any questions. The committee inquired about preceptor recruitment. S. Wicklum replied that if anyone knows of rural or urban family doctors who might be good preceptors to please let her know. The committee inquired about potential impact of the Alberta Government’s proposed Bill 21 legislation, S. Wicklum said they need to be prepared depending on what happens. S. Wicklum mentioned she has heard from a lot of preceptors that either way Bill 21 won’t impact the way they teach, but mentioned two potential new preceptors who were in discussions decided to back down from teaching because of it. The committee inquired into planetary health workshops in the Clerkship – S. Wicklum mentioned she is not an expert in the field but is surrounded by a lot of people who are and if anyone is interested in this topic to let her know. K. Busche mentioned there is a student group organized nationally across medical schools, hoping to see more planetary health curriculum, and if planetary medicine was added to the Clerkship it could potentially be great. K. Ragan inquired about the hours break down in the Clerkship, S. Wicklum mentioned many of the Clerks want to do a bit more hours and don’t mind going over, but as a rule they try and stick to a 55 hour work week rule. K. Ragan mentioned she really liked the idea of Clerks preparing infographics and asked if there was a preceptor in the room when they were presenting the prepared infographics, S. Wicklum replied that there is a preceptor in the room and students are encouraged to share their infographic with the team at their sites. S. Weeks inquired if S. Wicklum had utilized the CME office’s huge database of potential preceptors in rural settings. S. Wicklum mentioned she thought it was a great idea to collaborate more with CME and would look into it. M. Louis asked what the ideal size of preceptor pool was for the Clerkship versus the size of the pool they currently have. S. Wicklum mentioned ideally preceptors would take at least 3-4 Clerks per year for a 4 week block at a minimum – as that is the time felt to be needed for the preceptors’ office to get into the flow, know what they are doing, be used to it. S. Wicklum mentioned right now the preceptor pool is tight and they would like to have at least 5 more solid rural preceptors and 3-5 more solid urban preceptors. M. Louis inquired about preceptors with specialized practises. S. Wicklum mentioned as a base requirement the preceptors should have a broad base exposure of patients they are seeing, and need to have five days a week availability – if they work 3 days a week, and have a partner who works 2 other days a week – that is acceptable if they and their practise partner combine to offer the five days for learning.

**MOTION:** Yes – 13 / No – 1 / Abstain – 0

That the Clerkship Committee accept the Family Medicine Clerkship Report as given by S. Wicklum to the Clerkship Committee’s meeting held January 21, 2020.

CARRIED

K. Busche thanked S. Wicklum for the nice balance of details in the report.

6. Standing Updates

6.1 Report from Student Representatives

A. Maini mentioned he had started his first rotation as had many of the students on electives. A. Maini mentioned W. Kennedy had mentioned they were hopeful the core rotation boot camp would be remaining in place because they had heard a lot of positive feedback about it.

6.2 Other UME Committees (UMEC, PCC, SEC)

C. Naugler mentioned there was no update to give from UMEC.

S. Weeks gave an update from PCC. S. Weeks mentioned log book completions have been looked into for the Introduction to Clinical Practice Course, so now students get used to filling in logbooks and when they get into Clerkship it isn’t something completely new and they are used to the process.
J. Desy gave an update from SEC. J. Desy mentioned she was not sure if it was brought up yet, but the meeting prior to lost they voted on having two different examinations in each course for Clerkship – J. Desy mentioned she would be talking to each of the Clerkship Chairs and Directors in the coming months, with the goal of finding a way of dividing existing questions to create two different examinations that could be alternated through.

A. Maini inquired about the status of the policy on Clerkship shadowing which had been brought up last meeting, he said he felt they had a productive discussion around buy-in from the Clerkship Directors and wanted to know if there was anything proactively that could be done to further discussions in advance of the next UMEC meeting on January 31. The committee had a spirited discussion around the potential of shadowing for Clerks in UME. S. Bannister mentioned that she could support shadowing if there were stipulations in place: if a student had done zero electives in a specialty previously, then she could be sympathetic that they desire exposure to that specialty as a career exploration exercise. J. Haws inquired into who was going to adjudicate the process, the time that would be required to go through the student’s file to ensure they were meeting whatever shadowing criteria was decided upon. K. Busche mentioned that hypothetically he thought he would be the one who would have to be vetting the potential shadowing requests. M. Louis asked what happens if students shadow without registering it in OSLER. K. Busche mentioned if UME became aware that students were shadowing without registering it in OSLER it would be an issue, lack of liability coverage would put students, patients, and preceptors in unsafe situations. M. Louis mentioned allowing shadowing could result in increased competition: if students learn other students are shadowing then they may feel compelled to also shadow, which could increase the work load and stress on students, and potentially be unfair to students who families at home. G. Gelfand inquired into insurance issues around shadowing. K. Busche mentioned S. Leskosky would have to look into the insurance and coverage issues if a shadowing policy did move forward. M. Paget mentioned some students had said shadowing may be the only way for them to get exposure to the kind of career specialties they may be interested in. A. Maini said students see shadowing as a potentially useful expenditure of time, and would help them feel greater autonomy over their time and career. M. Davis mentioned in her role overseeing Career Exploration for Pre-Clerkship she would be happy to be a part of the discussion around how shadowing could be operationalized for Clerkship students.

7. New Business
K. Busche moved to the “New Business” portion of the agenda.

7.1 End of Rotations Feedback forms
K. Busche mentioned there was a desire at UME to shorten the “End of Rotations Feedback” form as it existed. K. Busche mentioned the new form as proposed is more standardized across the Clerkships, however UME is open to manipulating and customizing the form for specific Clerkships – like adding a few specific questions tailored to that specific rotation, but ideally for a limited period, like two years – this would allow for the Clerkship to monitor how new things added to their unique Clerkships were being received. K. Busche mentioned that the top part of the form, and those specific questions would remain static across Clerkships to allow for standardized data that would be easier to track and use.

M. Paget mentioned that he had worked with A. Maini and T. Haws to come up with a model for proportional funding on the forms, so every time one of the forms is completed it adds 50 cents to that class’s graduation funding – with a ceiling of $2000. This funding model was identified as a strong motivator to encourage student participation.

MOTION: Yes – 14 / No – 0 / Abstain – 1
That the Clerkship Committee accept the “End of Rotations Feedback” forms, and funding model, as presented to the Clerkship Committee’s meeting held January 21, 2020.

7.2 Clerkship Student Feedback Policy
K. Busche mentioned that the “Clerkship Student Feedback” policy had required some editing, specifically around the timing of when the feedback is provided. K. Busche went over the sections of the policy that had been edited and explained what had been edited and the thought-process behind it.

**MOTION: Yes – 12 / No – 0 / Abstain – 1**
That the Clerkship Committee accept the “Clerkship Student Feedback” policy, and send it to the UMEC for their approval, as presented to the Clerkship Committee’s meeting held January 21, 2020.

**CARRIED**

7.3 Terms of Reference
K. Busche mentioned that the committee’s “Terms of Reference” had required some amendments, specifically around Membership. The group had a discussion around the Terms of Reference as proposed, and what impact the intended changes would have on the committee. The group agreed that student representatives would be allowed to vote by proxy for other class year’s student representatives, if no representative from that class year was present to vote. The group agreed that PGME would assist in filling vacancies for Resident Representatives and that the committee could have up to two resident representatives, who would each receive their own vote.

**MOTION: Yes – 14 / No – 0 / Abstain – 0**
That the Clerkship Committee accept the “Terms of Reference” as amended, and send it to the UMEC for their approval, as it was presented to the Clerkship Committee’s meeting held January 21, 2020.

**CARRIED**

4.2 Budget Update
Committee guest K. Chadbolt, UME Finance Manager arrived. The committee agreed to jump back up to item 4.2 “Budget Update” which had been tabled earlier in the meeting. K. Chadbolt reported that previous instruction given regarding in-year budget cuts had been revisited, with the result that targeted cuts to specific AMHSP departments was not feasible. These three departments (Pediatrics, Internal Medicine and Psychiatry) all had their mandatory clerkship budgets restored in line with the other departments. K. Chadbolt also reported that the Fiscal 2020-21 budget envelope is flat from last year, but UME still has to reach the $440,000 cut that was mandated during last year’s budget process. K. Chadbolt mentioned there will be a reduction in the clerkship per-week payment in order to meet UME’s budget target. K. Chadbolt mentioned the targets come from the Provost’s office and cuts will be across the board. K. Chadbolt assured everyone that their departments would continue to be paid moving forward. C. Naugle mentioned that UME is looking at every line item on their budget, and considered a hiring freeze, total evaluation of all existing positions, and anything that can be done in terms of leveraging income coming in. C. Naugler assured everyone they have looked at every alternative with the mandate that has been given.

7.4 Review of 10 Graduation Education Objectives
The committee reviewed a list of the 10 Graduation Education Objectives. K. Busche asked committee members to pass on to their Clerkship Directors and to stress they should be in the back of people’s mind whenever they are doing UME work.

7.5 Clinical Presentations List
The committee reviewed the Clinical Presentations List that has recently been circulated around by J. Desy. K. Busche mentioned nothing needed to be done with the list currently, but over the course of the year J. Desy and K. Busche would be setting up times with Clerkship Directors and Evaluation Coordinators to give a list of what is currently in the log book for their clerkship, to review the list, to look at where discrepancies exist between the log book and the clinical presentation list, to negotiate differences to ensure everything is covered, and to look at how presentations are blueprinted against Clerkships.

7.6 Certificates
Certificates was tabled until the end of the meeting.
7.7 Accreditation
K. Busche reminded committee members that the upcoming interim accreditation should be on their radar, there would be a site visit from two people coming to review everything being done atUME. K. Busche mentioned this site visit would be a small version of what was done in 2016 for the full accreditation. K. Busche mentioned the anticipated date of the visit to be January or February of 2021. K. Busche mentioned some prep would be done beforehand with each Clerkship to ensure people were aware of things they would need to know and prepare for.

7.8 Connect Care Training
K. Busche mentioned that Connect Care Training was going to be rolled out geographically, and that Clerks would be in various places when Connect Care was rolled out to them. K. Busche thanked S-A. Facchini and S. Tai for going through each of the Clerk’s schedules and seeing where they would be when they were impacted by a geographic wave of Connect Care. K. Busche mentioned Clerks would need to be trained in Connect Care, it was mandatory, and that every Clerkship would likely lose some Clerks for at least half of a day in order to allow them to do their training. S. Bannister mentioned that she had heard it would take more than a half day to be fully trained. K. Busche mentioned that UME had met many times with the Connect Care people, and their understanding was at least half of a day of face-to-face training, but a large component of the training could be done online in modules. S. Bannister mentioned she thought losing Clerks for half of a day of training could be acceptable, but if it ends up being something like two days then it becomes more difficult to work around.

7.6 Certificates
Committee member L. Oakenfold, Clerkship Administrative Assistant arrived. The committee agreed to jump back up to item 7.6 “Certificates” which had been tabled earlier in the meeting. K. Busche thanked L. Oakenfold for a near decade of service to the Committee as the Administrator, and gave her a certificate of excellence acknowledging the same.

8. Next Meeting
K. Busche mentioned that the next meeting of the committee would be on February 25, 2020, that it would be in room 1405B instead of the regular committee room, and that Course Reports were due for Emergency Medicine, Electives and UCLIC.

9. Adjournment
K. Busche asked the committee to vote on adjourning the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION: Unanimous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That the Clerkship Committee be adjourned and reconvene on February 25, 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 2:34 PM by K. Busche (Chair).