

## Pediatric Residents Academic Support Committee Terms of Reference

- 1 The Academic Support Committee will monitor the evaluation and promotion of residents within the program.
- 2 The committee will meet at least three times a year.
- 3 The membership of the committee will include the Program Director (Chair), 2 or 3 faculty involved in the Residency Training Committee, 1 faculty that is not a committee member, the site director for the Waterloo program and the chief resident(s).
- 4 The principle of confidentiality will be strictly respected
- 5 The Academic Support Committee actions will be guided by the Evaluation Policy of the McMaster Post-Graduate Medical Education Office.
- 6 The records of all residents will be reviewed twice a year. The committee must review the entire record of a resident who has received a provisional satisfactory, unsatisfactory or incomplete evaluation during any rotation evaluation. The committee, at the discretion of the Program Director, can review the overall performance of any resident.
- 7 Residents receiving **PROVISIONAL SATISFACTORY, UNSATISFACTORY or INCOMPLETE** evaluations:
  - a) In all cases, the Program Director and resident shall meet as soon as reasonably possible to discuss and review the In-Training Evaluation Report (ITER) and all supporting documentation. This will be followed by further discussion at the Academic Support Committee.
  - b) The resident may elect to accept or reject the designation. If s/he elects to reject the designation, s/he may appeal the designation at Level 1 Appeals – Program Level, in accordance with Section VII (Appeals) of the postgraduate evaluation policy.
- 8 If the resident accepts the designation: The Academic Support Committee will follow the guidelines set out by the Postgraduate Medicine Evaluation Policy with respect to a) reporting to the education advisory board (2 provisional or 1 unsatisfactory) and b) initiating a remediation plan.
- 9 Level 1 Appeals: Program Level
  - a) A resident may submit an appeal to the Academic Support Committee in respect of any procedural or substantive decision

(i.e. decisions involving academic judgment or speciality specific skills) arising out of the Evaluation Process, including a decision to indicate a designation other than “Satisfactory” on the resident’s ITER.

- b) All appeals submitted at Level 1 must include a written statement from the resident clearly stating the decision(s) under appeal, providing detailed reasons why the decision is thought to be incorrect or inaccurate, and the desired result. The resident is encouraged to submit the appeal no later than 2 weeks after they become aware of the decision under appeal.
- c) Once the Program Director has received an appeal, s/he must provide the Student with a copy of the Postgraduate Evaluation Policy and Procedures, along with any program specific evaluation policies.
- d) The Student must be offered the opportunity to attend the committee meeting where his/her case is being reviewed. The Student must be provided the opportunity to invite relevant individuals and / or counsel.
- e) If the Student does not agree with the committee’s decision, s/he has the option to appeal all matters to the Evaluation Advisory Board.
- f) If the program committee is unable to reach a decision on the issue, the Program may elect to refer the matter to the Evaluation Advisory Board.
- g) There must be written report documenting the details and the outcome of all appeals. A copy is sent to the Assistant Dean, Postgraduate Medical Education, as well a copy is maintained in the Student’s file.
- h) For residents completing a Pre-Entry Assessment Program (PEAP), an Assessment Verification Period (AVP), a Practice Ready Assessment (PRA), or clinical examinations (STACERs), the sole remedy that may be granted following a successful appeal is the ability to repeat relevant components of the assessment or the clinical event, as applicable, one more time only.

10 The Academic Support Committee can recommend the withdrawal of a resident from the training program for academic or non-academic reasons. This recommendation will be sent to the Education Advisory Board (EAB).

- 11 After an Academic Support Committee meeting, if concerns have been raised, a letter delineating the concerns will be sent to the resident, with a copy to the resident advisor. The resident will be advised to meet with his/her advisor to develop an education remedial plan that addresses the pertinent issues as per the Academic Support Committee's recommendations. The education plan should be submitted to the Chair of the Academic Support Committee (Program Director) and the Academic Support Faculty Member. If the resident is being forwarded to the ERB, this will also be stated in the letter.
  
- 12 The AB-ITE, MCQ, SAQ and OSCE examinations are both formative and summative in our program. Residents who perform below their group average on the AB-ITE (American Board In-Training Exam), the OSCE, MCQ and/or the SAQ exam will be sent a letter requiring the resident to complete a level A, B or C remediation plan. (See Appendix A)
  - i) Level A suggested triggers:
    - (a) One result below group average
  - ii) Level B suggested triggers:
    - (a) Provisional Satisfactory evaluation on a rotation
    - (b) Two results below group average
  - iii) Level C suggested triggers:
    - (a) Two Provisional Satisfactory evaluations.
    - (b) One Unsatisfactory evaluation on any rotation
    - (c) Three or more results below group average
    - (d) Provisional Satisfactory on any rotation and two or more scores below group average
  
- 13 The committee will review former residents that were unsuccessful in the Royal College exams.
  
- 14 The committee will be responsible for the promotion of residents from year to year. Residents will need to achieve the all items listed in Appendix B to be promoted to the next year. Any resident undergoing remediation will need to have successfully completed the remediation plan in order to be promoted. If the plan is a longitudinal plan, the committee will ensure that the timelines are being achieved before recommending promotion. Not achieving all the elements does not necessarily mean the resident will not be promoted. The committee will make recommendations for residents who have not completed the required elements for promotion. This may require residents to complete certain tasks in a set time period as a condition of promotion.



## Appendix A:

### Levels of Remediation:

- Level A.       The resident will review and personally reflect on their scores develop a personal learning plan.
  
- Level B.       The resident will review their scores and meet with their resident advisor and develop a learning plan that needs to be submitted to the Program Director and Academic Support Faculty.
  
- Level C        The resident will review their scores and meet with their resident advisor and develop a learning plan with achievable timelines. After which they will make an appointment with the Academic Support Faculty to review the learning plan. The plan then should be submitted to the Program Director.

## Appendix B:

### **PGY 1**

- All ITERs Successful
- Mini-CEX completed for each rotation
- Learning Contract completed for each rotation
- OSCE, MCQ, SAQ and ABP scores within or above their group average
- Completed two STACERs
- Completed all aspects of the Portfolio
- Completed all aspects of and has maintained minimum MGLA credits
- Has participated in one CME activity
- If a remediation plan has been prescribed, has followed through on the plan and has successfully met the criteria for completing the remediation plan
- Has a research idea and supervisor in place
- Met advisor on a regular basis, has reviewed portfolio with their advisor, and has reviewed and signed their year-end summary.
- Completed two Multisource Feedback Evaluations

### **PGY 2**

- All ITERs Successful
- Mini-CEX completed for each rotation
- Learning Contract completed for each rotation
- OSCE, MCQ, SAQ and ABP scores within or above their group average
- Completed two STACERs
- Completed all aspects of the Portfolio
- Completed all aspects of and has maintained minimum MGLA credits
- Has participated in one CME activity
- Has submitted all documentation for electives
- If a remediation plan has been prescribed, has followed through on the plan and has successfully met the criteria for completing the remediation plan
- Has presented research at work in progress or is scheduled to do so in their PGY 3 year.
- Met advisor on a regular basis, has reviewed portfolio with their advisor, and has reviewed and signed their year-end summary
- Completed two Multisource Feedback Evaluations

### **PGY 3**

- All ITERs Successful
- Mini-CEX completed for each rotation
- Learning Contract completed for each rotation
- OSCE, MCQ, SAQ and ABP scores within or above their group average
- Completed two STACERs and or passed the Royal College Part one Exam
- Completed all aspects of the Portfolio
- Completed all aspects of and has maintained minimum MGLA credits
- Has participated in one CME activity
- If a remediation plan has been prescribed, has followed through on the plan and has successfully met the criteria for completing the remediation plan
- Has submitted abstract for presentation and or has presented work as per the research committee guidelines
- Met advisor on a regular basis, has reviewed portfolio with their advisor, and has reviewed and signed their year-end summary
- Completed two Multisource Feedback Evaluations

### **PGY 4**

- All ITERs Successful
- Mini-CEX completed for each rotation
- Learning Contract completed for each rotation
- OSCE, MCQ, SAQ and ABP scores within or above their group average
- Completed all aspects of the Portfolio
- Completed all aspects of and has maintained minimum MGLA credits
- Has participated in one CME activity
- If a remediation plan has been prescribed, has followed through on the plan and has successfully met the criteria for completing the remediation plan
- Has submitted abstract for presentation and or has presented work as per the research committee guidelines
- Submit their abstract to the program director
- Completed educational project
- Participated in at least one faculty development
- Met advisor on a regular basis, has reviewed portfolio with their advisor, and has reviewed and signed their year-end summary
- Completed two Multisource Feedback Evaluations

CME: the CME activity should be an external activity. Conferences that are part of AHD are not counted.

Any resident falling below their group average will be required to submit a level A, B or C remediation plan, which will have to be successfully completed in order to be considered for promotion.