

Data Management Advisory Group

Terms of Reference

October 2020

PGMEAC Oct 23 2020

Mandate

The advisory group serves as a forum for coordinated discussion, consultation and development of recommendations regarding the **collection, evaluation/analysis and reporting** of MD and PGME learning experience/environment data in a harmonized and aligned manner.

For the purposes of this advisory group, **data management refers to the collection, analysis and reporting of learning experience/environment data for knowledge mobilization and quality assurance/improvement purposes.**



What is Data Management?

Responsibilities

Develop and recommend operational **principles, guidelines and processes** that will enable and support **harmonized and aligned** learning experience/environment **data collection, evaluation/analysis and reporting:**

- Development of and revisions to data collection tools (surveys, course/rotation evaluations etc.)
- Methodology for data collection including question standardization, frequency of reporting, etc. (e.g., LACT)
- Data and reporting for accreditation purposes
- Reporting structures, templates, permissions and pathways (e.g., Voice of Surveys)
- Data management roles and responsibilities, including action taken in response to reports

Responsibilities



Development of a comprehensive understanding of internally- and externally-managed MD and PGME learning experience/environment data sets



Support ongoing communications regarding available learning experience/environment data and reports.



Provide advice/recommendations regarding non-standard requests for learning experience/environment data reports



Act as a resource regarding the effectiveness of data collection, evaluation/analysis, and reporting processes



Monitor and support data management to ensure consistency across the Faculty of Medicine and with U of T policies and guidelines

DMAG & Recommendations of PG CI Working Group – Institutional Accreditation Standard #9

“There is continuous improvement of the learning sites to improve the educational experience, ensuring the learning environment is appropriate, safe and conducive to preparing residents for independent practice.”

Recommendation	Status
1. Develop and distribute summary report outlining available data and reports (POWER, IRC, VoTR etc.) confirming access and ownership	<i>Complete</i>
2. Develop guidelines to outline expectations for learning sites relevant to Institutional Standard 9: interpretations and practical examples	<i>Under review and discussion with DMAG</i>

Response to Recommendations of PG CI Working Group – Institutional Accreditation Standard #9

Recommendation	Status
3. Develop guidelines that clarify when a residency training program (e.g. program director, site director etc.) should inform the learning site (e.g. vice-chairs of education, education directors) of relevant site-specific issues identified.	<i>DMAG (reporting guidelines and processes)</i>
4. Ensure upcoming improvements to Elentra with regards to rotation and teacher evaluations are informed by the expectations of learning sites relevant to Institutional Standard 9.	<i>DMAG / Elentra WG</i>
5. Review and consider frequency of site specific reports (IRC, rotation, teaching etc) including alert structures	<i>DMAG / Elentra WG</i>
6. Determine reporting expectations from sites to PGME to ensure requirements are being met	<i>Under review and discussion</i>

Membership

Caroline Abrahams, Director, Policy, Analysis & Systems, PGME (*co-Chair*)

David Rojas, Evaluation Scientist, MD Program (*co-Chair*)

Susan Glover Takahashi, Director, Education & Research, Post MD Education

Mahan Kulasegaram, Education Scientist, MD Program

David Tihanyi, Manager, Assessment and Evaluation, MD Program

Paul Tonin, Manger, Strategic Operations & Policy, MD Program

Mariela Ruetalo, Research Officer, PGME