

<b>Student Assessment Sub-Committee</b>		<b>DATE</b>	February 25, 2015
		<b>ROOM</b>	PDCS Room 4
<b>CHAIR</b>	Dr. Vernon Curran, Chair		
<b>MEMBERS:</b>  <b>2013 - 2014</b>	<i>Dr. Victor Maddalena, Phase 1 Lead</i> <i>Dr. Lisa Kenny, Phase 2 Lead</i> <i>Dr. Joanne Hickey, Phase 3 Lead</i> <i>Dr. Katherine Stringer, Phase 4 Lead (Clerkship Coordinator)</i> <i>Dr. Amanda Pendergast, Phase 1 Assessment Lead</i> <i>Dr. Mike Hogan, Phase 2 Assessment Lead</i> <i>Dr. Jatin Morkar, Phase 3 Assessment Co-Lead</i> <i>Dr. Gokul Vidyasankar, Phase 3 Assessment Co-Lead</i> <i>Dr. Catherine Mah, Member-at-Large</i> <i>Dr. Jessica Downing, PAIRN Representative</i> <i>Dr. Donald W. McKay, Associate Dean, UGME</i> <i>Dr. Sean Murphy, Chair – UGMS Committee</i> <i>Ms. Diana Deacon, Educational Specialist (MESc)</i> <i>Mr. Stephen Pennell, Manager, Health Education Technology and Learning</i> <i>Mr. Chris Harty – Phase 1-3 Student Representative</i> <i>Ms. Stephanie Power-MacDonald, Clerkship Student Representative</i> <i>Ms. Melody Marshall, UGME Coordinator</i>		
<b>PARTICIPANTS</b>	Dr. V. Curran, Dr. C. Mah, Ms. D. Deacon, Mr. S. Pennell, Mr. C. Harty, Dr. G. Vidyasankar, Dr. Jatin Morkar, Dr. Amanda Pendergast		
<b>RECORDING SECRETARY</b>	<i>(Minutes Taped)</i>		
<b>INVITED GUEST</b>			
<b>REGRETS</b>	Dr. D. McKay, Dr. K. Stringer, Dr. J. Downing, Ms. S. Power-MacDonald, Ms. G. McGrath		
<b>MINUTES</b>			
<b>AGENDA</b>	<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
WELCOME	The Chair convened the meeting at 4:00 p.m.		
#1 REVIEW & APPROVAL OF MINUTES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Item 1.a Approval of October 2014 Minutes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minutes for January 28, 2015 were not approved at this meeting.</li> </ul>	<b>ACTION: Minutes for the January 28, 2015 minutes to be approved at the March 25, 2015 meeting.</b>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Item 1.b Follow-up on action items</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The chair of UGMS will contact all the faculty members involved in the upcoming Phase 2 and remind them about the recommendation that rubrics are to be used for all written assignments.</li> <li>Clerkship coordinator will continue to work with HSIMS on ITARs</li> <li>Clerkship Assessment form has been added to the table of indicators to be reviewed annually.</li> <li>Updated Internal Medicine Assessment map will be presented to UGMS for review.</li> <li>Draft Revisions to the clinic cards will be presented at the next clerkship meeting.</li> <li>Students have questions about the process of handling Challenge cards for exams.</li> </ul>	<p><b>ACTION: In progress.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: Follow up in March meeting.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: Follow up.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: Follow up with Dr. Stringer.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: See Student Issues</b></p>
#2 Accreditation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accreditation ongoing, with no issues arising. Accreditors seem to be positive.</li> </ul>	
#3 Assessment Updates	Phase I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues to report for Phase I</li> </ul>	
	Phase II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be updated at the March 25<sup>th</sup> meeting.</li> </ul>	
	Phase III	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students are questioning if challenge cards were being reviewed individually and what process was followed in the examination reviews.</li> </ul>	<b>ACTION: See Student Issues</b>
#4 Clerkship Assessment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be updated at the March 25<sup>th</sup> meeting.</li> </ul>	

Updates			
#5 Student Issues	a. Challenge Cards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ms. Deacon explained the procedure for reviewing the challenge cards. Problematic questions are identified based on challenge cards and item performance statistics. The problematic questions are sent back to the individual instructors for review. The instructor then decides if the question will or will not receive credit.</li> </ul>	<b>ACTION: Mr. Harty will forward this information to both class presidents to be conveyed to the classes.</b>
	b. Exam Spiral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students who have to reassess are becoming frustrated with having to write so many exams in such a short amount of time.</li> <li>Two options were presented: Carry on as is or to change the assessment plan. It was decided to carry on as is with the assessment plan.</li> </ul>	<b>ACTION: Mr. Harty will take this back to the class to get a wider perspective on the issue.</b>
	c. Phase 3 MED 7710 Block 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This block consists of the highest number of instructional hours for the Phase 3 MED 7710 course. Students are concerned about the summative exam.</li> <li>Options discussed: Keep as is in assessment plan Move some content from block to previous or next exam Recommended to keep as is in assessment plan</li> </ul>	
#6 Formative/ Summative Assessment Monitoring/ Evaluation	a. Reports from Education Specialist (Diana Deacon)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reports to table.</li> </ul>	
	b. Responses to reports from Course Chairs/Phase Leads (Diana Deacon)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phase II assessment reports have been sent out. No responses to date.</li> </ul>	
	c. Quality Review of Assessment Tools/Instruments (Diana Deacon)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work in progress for Phase III.</li> </ul>	

	d. Phase 3 Exam Blueprints (Diana Deacon)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topics without questions: Endometrial, uterine cancer and liver problem based learning (sclerosis). Blueprinting is working when the questions come in from faculty.</li> </ul>	
#7 Assessment Policy		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft policy has come down from UGMS for review. The new policy is to the point, very brief, 4 points and states that all courses must have an assessment plan.</li> </ul>	<b>ACTION: Ms. Deacon to email policy and procedures to committee members to get feedback within 1 week.</b>
#8 Phase 1-3 written assignment overview		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of requirements of written assignments and marks attributed to each across all three Phases. Shows inconsistency within and across the Phases in terms of assignment lengths and weighting.</li> <li>• Suggestion to classify 2 or 3 main categories of written assignments, i.e. reflection assignments and analytical essays. In each category could develop guidelines for length and weighting.</li> <li>• Working Group to follow up on review. Dr. Mah, Dr. Curran, Mr. Pennell and Ms. Deacon to form working group.</li> </ul>	<b>ACTION: Working Group will develop suggested guidelines.</b>
#9 Clinical decision making questions (MCCQE Part I)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deferred to next meeting</li> </ul>	<b>ACTION: Ms. Deacon to report on progress of Working Group in March meeting</b>
#10 Business Arising		There was no further business.	
Adjournment		The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.	