**Competence Committee Review Checklist**

Program Name: Click or tap here to enter text.

Date of Meeting: Click or tap to enter a date.

Reviewed By: Click or tap here to enter text.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reflect on the following:** | **Yes** | **No** | **N/A** | **Comment** |
| Is there a Competence Committee Terms of Reference (TOR)? Does it cover the required elements (e.g. membership, meeting frequency, quorum, responsibilities, etc.)? |  |  |  |  |
| Based on the TOR, does membership include representation from allied health and/or out-of-department/division faculty? |  |  |  |  |
| Is the frequency of meetings enough to ensure each trainee is discussed at regular intervals? |  |  |  |  |
| Were minutes to a previous meeting provided? If yes, do the minutes clearly document committee attendance and the recommendation and rationale for each trainee? |  |  |  |  |
| Was an agenda provided in advance of the meeting? |  |  |  |  |
| At the start of the meeting, did the Chair confirm the agenda and remind members about the confidentiality of the proceedings? Did they ask about any potential conflict of interest? |  |  |  |  |
| Were conflicts of interest declared for any trainee? If a COI exists, did members excuse themselves from the discussion? |  |  |  |  |
| Was a primary reviewer assigned to each trainee? Did this task appear to be equally distributed (taking into account the number of CC members and trainees being reviewed)? |  |  |  |  |
| Did the primary reviewer for each trainee provide a summary of the trainee’s progress and propose a status recommendation? |  |  |  |  |
| Was the proposed status based on a review of multiple types of assessment (i.e. not solely based on EPAs)? If possible, note the assessment types referenced in the comments. |  |  |  |  |
| Was hearsay introduced during the discussion? Was information introduced without appropriate documentation in Elentra or the resident file? |  |  |  |  |
| Did the CC identify a trainee as ‘not progressing as expected’ or ‘failure to progress’? If yes, does the CC have a process in place to manage this? |  |  |  |  |
| Did the CC identify a trainee as ‘progress is accelerated’? If yes, does the CC have a process in place to manage this? |  |  |  |  |
| Were all members provided the opportunity to contribute to the discussion? |  |  |  |  |
| Were all members able to vote on the proposed recommendation? |  |  |  |  |
| Were any status recommendations deferred? If yes, outline the reason and the plan for follow-up. |  |  |  |  |
| Does the CC appear to have a process in place to document and notify trainees of the outcome? Does the process change depending on the trainee’s status? |  |  |  |  |
| Does the CC appear to have a process in place to notify the Residency Program Committee of the meeting outcomes? Does the process change depending on the trainee’s status? |  |  |  |  |

**Reviewer’s overall recommendation:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| No concerns noted. |  |
| The following concerns or recommendations have been noted: | |
|  | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Signature: |  | Date: |  |