Student Assessment Sub-Committee				DATE	June 25, 2014			
				ROOM	PDCS Room 4			
CHAIR		Dr. Vernon Curran,						
MEMBERS:		Dr. Donald W. McKay, Associate Dean, UGME						
		Dr. John McLean, BioMedical Sciences Representative						
2013 - 2014		Dr. Barton Thiessen, Clinical Representative						
		Dr. Weldon Bonnell, Humanities Representative						
		Dr. James Valcour, Community Health Representative						
		Dr. Katherine Stringer, Clerkship Coordinator						
		Dr. Bruce Sussex, Pre-Clerkship Coordinator (Dr. Tanis Adey)						
		Dr. Sean Murphy, Chair – UGMS Committee						
		Dr. Lisa Kenny, Phase 2 Lead						
			r. Victor Maddalena, Phase 1 Lead					
			nase 2 Assessment Working Group					
			Dr. Amanda Pendergast, Phase 1 Assessment Working Group					
		Ms. Diana Deacon, Educational Specialist (MESC)						
		Mr. Stephen Pennell, Manager, Health Education Technology and Learning						
		Ms. Saghar Sadeghi, Clerkship Student Representative Ms. Stephanie Power-MacDonald, Pre-Clerkship Student Representative						
		Ms. Stephanie Power-MacDonala, Pre-Clerkship Student Representative Ms. Melody Marshall, UGME Coordinator						
· · · · · ·								
PARTICIPANTS Dr. V. Curran, Dr. J		Dr. v. Curran, Dr. J.	McLean, Dr. W. Bonnell, Dr. J. Valcour, Ms. D. Deacon, Dr. B. Sussex, Dr. K. Stringer					
RECORDING SECR	RETARY	Ms. Jane Stevens (Minutes Taped)					
INVITED GUEST		Dr. C. Stone						
REGRETS Dr. D. McKay, Dr.		Dr. D. McKay, Dr. V	7. Maddalena, Ms. Stephanie Power-MacDonald					
			MINUTES					
AGENDA		ITEM	DISCUSSION		ACTION			
WELCOME	The	Chair convened	Call to order.					
	the	meeting at 4:15	Quorum in attendance.					
	p.m	1.						
#1	•	ltem 1.a	• The Minutes from May 28, 2014 were adopted as presented.	ACTION	: Minutes Approved			
REVIEW &	Арр	proval of May 2014						
APPROVAL OF	Mir	nutes	It was MOVED by J. Valcour, Seconded by W. Bonnell to accept the					
MINUTES			Minutes of the May 28, 2014 meeting as presented.					
			All were in favour and the MOTION CARRIED					

	• Item 1.b Follow-up on Action Items	Phase 1 assessment maps must be reviewed and confirmed with the Phase 1 Lead. The Lead will then provide feedback to the assessment lead for the Phase. This should be completed in advance of the start of classes. Specific attention will be paid to in-Phase remediation.	ACTION: D. Deacon will follow up with Phase 1 Lead. ACTION: Meeting date to be agreed upon for the review of assessment maps via email.
#2 MONITORING INDICATORS 2014- 2015		Metrics collected and reviewed	ACTION: Change the naming of Pre-Clerkship to Phases 1-4 for item 1. And for item 2. remove "pre-clerkship and clerkship" to the words "the phases" ACTION: Update the Assessment Evaluation Indicators chart and review again next meeting.
#3 SUMMARY AND QUALITY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENT TOOLS/ INSTRUMENTS		A quality assurance process is in the planning stages. This process will entail having an inventory of assessment tools and instruments contained in a central repository. Currently, the items are housed on the MESC common drive. The work is in progress.	ACTION: Add a column to the Quality check of assessment tools and instruments table entitled Rubric. ACTION: Promote rubrics to all faculty members on the basis of evaluation objectivity and consistency. Provide a template.
#4 PHASE I & II ASSESSMENT UPDATES	 Item 4.a Review Assessment Maps – Phase I Clinical Skills and Community Engagement 	D. Deacon provided an update. UGMS has not yet approved phase remediation rules. A new Assessment policy is in development.	
#5 CLERKSHIP ASSESSMENT UPDATES		 C. Stone (Discipline of Surgery Coordinator) gave a historical account of the percentage value of the NBME that he inherited. Currently the NBME is worth 60% while in other rotations the NBME is worth approximately 30%. There has been a correlation between the failing of this exam and 	ACTION: Compare student NBME marks to other assessment components of Surgery ACTION: Convene a small group meeting to review the above

		 students who perform poorly on their ITERS. Additionally, those who fail this exam tend to struggle across the rest of the rotations. Unfortunately, this exam does not match objectives for core Surgery and has a high number of Internal Medicine questions. If the percentage value of the exam were less than 60%, no one would fail the rotation. The option of making the overall value of the exam less with a mandatory pass was discussed but it was determined that to put a fail on the Dean's letter with a pass after remediation was punitive if their ITERs were outstanding. 	comparisons ACTION: D. Deacon will look at the ITER for quality improvement.
#6 FORMATIVE AND SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT - MONITORING AND EVALUATION	• Item 6.a. Reports from the Education Specialist	Student assessment report forms were circulated prior to the meeting andD. Deacon provided an overview of each course.i.ISD II Pathology W14 - Next meetingii.ISD II Geriatricsiii.ISD II Geriatrics - Pass mark lowered to 61iv.CS II Full Year report - (future meeting)v.CH II Critical Appraisal/Research Methodsvi.CH II Occupational Healthvii.CH II Nutrition in Community Health	
#6 FORMATIVE AND SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT - MONITORING AND EVALUATION	 Item 6.b. Responses to reports from Course Chairs/Phase Leads 	 i. Infectious Disease – Dr. Natalie Bridger ii. ISD II Women's Health – Dr. Sarah Healey iii. Phase 1 Clinical Skills – Dr. Victor Maddalena iv. Phase 1: The Healthy Person – Dr. Victor Maddalena The chain of distribution includes the Assessment Lead, the Phase Lead and the Associate Dean. 	
#6 FORMATIVE AND SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT - MONITORING AND EVALUATION	 Item 6.c. Summative exam 3 blueprint for Phase 2: The Patient 	The exam blueprint was circulated for review. The blueprint ensures that issues can be addressed prior to the next phase 2 iteration.	
#7 BUSINESS ARISING Next Meeting		There being no business arising from the Minutes, the meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.	