

FELLOWSHIP EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes of December 11, 2012 Meeting
8:00 AM to 9:30 AM – PGME Boardroom

Present:

Dr. Glen Bandiera (PGME)
Dr. Jeannette Goguen (Medicine)
Dr. Karen Gómez Hernández (Clinical Fellow)
John Kerr (PGME)
Dr. Ashesh Kumar (Clinical Fellow)
Dr. David Latter (FEAC Chair; Surgery)

Loreta Muharuma (PGME)
Dr. Benoit Mulsant (CAMH) *
Dr. Arun Ravindran (Psychiatry)
Dr. Salvatore Spadafora (PGME)
Dr. David Wong (Ophthalmology) *

* *By teleconference*

Guests:

Nathalie Novak (CPSO)

Melissa Collimore (CPSO)

Regrets:

Caroline Abrahams (PGME)
Dr. Charles Catton (Radiation Oncology)
Jessica Fillion (PGME)
Dr. Julie Johnstone (Clinical Fellow)
Dr. Jonathan Kronick (SickKids)

Dr. Cynthia Maxwell (Obstetrics & Gynaecology)
Dr. Rayfel Schneider (Paediatrics)
Shannon Spencer (Ex officio; UHN)
Dr. Roy Wyman (Family Medicine)

1. Introduction

Dr. Latter welcomed three new members to the FEAC: Dr. Arun Ravindran (succeeding Dr. Brenda Toner as Director, Fellowship Program; Department of Psychiatry), Dr. Julie Johnstone (Clinical Fellow, Department of Paediatrics) and Dr. Ashesh Kumar (Clinical Fellow, Department of Surgery).

Dr. Latter confirmed acceptance of the minutes of the FEAC meeting of October 2, 2012, after noting the need for correct labeling in the minutes of the Royal College fees for AFC (Diploma) programs.

2. Proposed PGME Review Process for Applications for AFC (Diploma) Program Accreditation

Dr. Spadafora presented a draft PGME review process for clinical fellowship programs at the University that wished to apply for Royal College accreditation as an Area of Focused Competence (Diploma) program. He clarified that prior clinical departmental educational review and approval, in accordance with established departmental governance of fellowship training, must be completed before an application can be submitted to the Vice Dean PGME for approval. He stressed that departmentally approved applications should be submitted to the Vice Dean no later than 30 days prior to the Royal College deadline, to allow the review of such applications by the Postgraduate Medical Education Advisory Committee (PGMEAC) and the Fellowship Education Advisory Committee (FEAC). He emphasized the need for input from stakeholders on the establishment of AFC programs at the University. Dr. Latter noted that it was current practice to examine current non-AFC fellowship programs for their impact on resources for residents and suggested that AFC programs could follow the same process. Dr. Spadafora suggested that an environmental scan of departmental practice could verify the degree of variation between departments in this area.

There was agreement on the need to distinguish the national-level from the university-level approval process, with the Royal College establishing AFC programs nationally and the universities approving the applications of individual fellowship programs to go forward for Royal College recognition as meeting nationally-established criteria. It was felt that the draft PGME review process needed to make this distinction clearer.

Dr. Ravindran remarked that established AFC programs could cross departments, making it important to establish departmental leadership of the application process.

Dr. Bandiera stressed the importance of a business plan for prospective AFC programs at the University level. He noted, for example, that accredited AFC programs would pay an annual \$2,000 Royal College registration fee regardless of trainee enrolment in the program. Committee members agreed on the need for clarity in the description of fees; for example, it should be clear that the annual AFC program registration fee was a university-wide fee and would not be payable for each hospital site of the fellowship. Dr. Bandiera recommended adding hyperlinks in the draft document to Royal College sources.

There was agreement that the appropriate role for the FEAC, as an advisory body to the Vice Dean PGME, would be for the committee to review, but not to approve, applications for AFC accreditation.

Noting that the next Royal College deadline for University fellowship programs to apply for AFC program accreditation was March 31, 2013, Dr. Spadafora indicated that a revised draft document would be circulated electronically to FEAC members for input early in 2013.

3. *Guidelines and Procedures for Educational Assessment and Management of Deficiencies in Clinical Fellowships: Update on Legal Review of Draft Document*

Dr. Spadafora briefly recounted the process that had led to the draft *Guidelines*, with two sub-groups of the FEAC drafting and re-drafting the document after detailed committee discussion. Dr. Spadafora described a blending of employment and educational issues in the resulting document. He stated that initial review of the document by the University's legal counsel indicated that the *Guidelines* would need to be refocused as an exclusively educational instrument. Dr. Spadafora affirmed that legal counsel would define what belongs to the University while acknowledging that fellowship training includes a labour component over which the University does not have jurisdiction. He looked forward to sharing the amended draft electronically with committee members following its review and revision by legal counsel.

4. CPSO Registration Initiatives for 2013-14

N. Novak (Manager of Applications and Credentials, Quality Management Division, College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario), accompanied by M. Collimore (Registration Analyst, Applications and Credentials, Quality Management Division, CPSO), outlined initiatives underway at the CPSO which would improve the registration process for clinical fellows. She emphasized that these changes were driven by the findings of surveys administered by the CPSO of its registrants, as well as by the CPSO's review of the results of the biannual surveys of University of Toronto clinical fellows that the FEAC had implemented.

N. Novak described the separation of application processing from the membership area of the CPSO and the removal of Registration Committee from credentialing as key changes to promote efficiencies and reduce redundancies in the registration process. She also outlined new quality checks introduced to ensure quality control in the implementation of change. She confirmed that the CPSO had increased and reorganized call centre staff to respond more effectively to clinical fellows and stakeholders. N. Novak described enhancements to be introduced to the online tracking system now accessible to new applicants for CPSO registration. She indicated that in January 2013 the CPSO would rollout a new administrative procedure which would allow applications with two or fewer requirements outstanding to be streamed out and followed up proactively.

Dr. Latter praised the CPSO for its commitment to balance regulatory responsibility with service awareness. He spoke for the committee in his appreciativeness to the CPSO for its recently-introduced registration initiatives.

5. Action Items

- a.) A revised draft of the proposed *PGME Review Process for Application for AFC Program Accreditation* would be prepared, incorporating the suggestions of the committee, and would be circulated electronically to FEAC members for input in January 2013.
- b.) Input from FEAC members to the draft revised Terms of Reference of the FEAC would be sought electronically prior to the next meeting of the FEAC, on March 5, 2013.
- c.) Dr. Latter indicated that, in response to recent queries, a draft document regarding clinical fellows and moonlighting would be circulated to committee members electronically for consideration prior to the next meeting on March 5, 2013.

The meeting adjourned at 9:35 AM.