

Student Assessment Sub-Committee		DATE	January 30, 2019
		ROOM	M2M240
CHAIR	Dr. Vernon Curran, Chair		
MEMBERS: 2018-2019	<p><i>Voting members:</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Pam Pike, Phase 1 Assessment Lead</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Barton Thiessen, Phase 2 Assessment Lead</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Jasbir Gill, Phase 3 Lead (until Phase 3 Assessment Lead is appointed)</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Norah Duggan, Phase 4 Lead</i></p> <p><i>Ms. Brooke Turner, Phase 1-3 Student</i></p> <p><i>Ms. Mais Nuaaman, Phase 4 Student</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Jeremy Loh, PARNL Resident</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Craig Moore, Member-at-Large</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Maisam Najafizada, Member-at-Large</i></p> <p><i>Ex officio (non-voting) members:</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Tanis Adey, Associate Dean, UGME</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Sean Murphy, Chair, UGMS Committee</i></p> <p><i>Ms. Gerona McGrath, PESC</i></p> <p><i>Ms. Diana Deacon, Educational Specialist, Assessment</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Stephen Pennell, Manager, Health Education Technology and Learning</i></p> <p><i>Ms. Elas Winter, Support Staff, UGME</i></p> <p><i>Ms. Carol Vokey, Support Staff, UGME</i></p>		
PARTICIPANTS	V. Curran, P. Pike, J. Gill, B. Turner, M. Nuaaman, C. Moore, T. Adey, G. McGrath, D. Deacon		
RECORDING SECRETARY	<i>(Minutes Taped) Transcribed by Carol Vokey</i>		
INVITED GUEST	Ms. Jacinta Reddigan, Policy Analyst		
REGRETS	B. Thiessen, N. Duggan, J. Loh, M. Najafizada, S. Murphy, S. Pennell		
MINUTES			
AGENDA	ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
WELCOME	The Chair convened the meeting at 1607h.	The Chair introduced J. Reddigan, Policy Analyst who will be discussing the Examination Invigilation Procedure.	
#1 REVIEW & APPROVAL OF MINUTES	1.1 Review and approval of agenda.	The agenda was approved.	

	1.2 Review and approval of November 28, 2018 minutes.	<p>The minutes of the November 28, 2018 meeting were reviewed.</p> <p>It was MOVED by B. Turner and SECONDED by C. Moore to approve the November 28, 2018 minutes as presented.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">All were in favour, and the MOTION CARRIED.</p>	<p>It was moved by B. Turner and seconded by C. Moore to approve the minutes of the November 28, 2018 meeting as presented. Motion carried.</p>
#2 BUSINESS ARISING	Action items from October meeting.	<p>D. Deacon to contact Obs/Gyne CDC to follow up on the addition of an Obs/Gyne EPA mid rotation. D. Deacon to contact CDCs to confirm that information in assessment plans and student handbook is the same.</p> <p>Once the Curriculum Review Report is complete, G. McGrath will follow up with D. Deacon re issues that relate directly to SAS.</p> <p>S. Pennell will work on solving the issue of having a countdown clock in the exam room.</p> <p>D. Deacon to follow up with PAWGs regarding providing reasoning behind answers to formative questions.</p> <p>D. Deacon to follow up with G. McGrath about reviewing list of assessment methods in MED 8710 evaluation forms.</p>	<p>ACTION: D. Deacon confirmed assessment plan information with all Phase 4 CDCs except Anesthesia and updated Student Handbook. Will contact Dr. Thiessen, who is the new Anesthesia CDC.</p> <p>ACTION: G. McGrath presenting summary to this meeting.</p> <p>ACTION: Ongoing</p> <p>ACTION: D. Deacon is awaiting direction from UGMS.</p> <p>ACTION: PESC is looking at changes.</p>
	2.1 Examination Invigilation Procedure (J. Reddigan)	<p>J. Reddigan presented and explained the Examination Invigilation Procedure. It was then discussed by the Committee.</p> <p>It was MOVED by V. Curran and SECONDED by P. Pike to approve the procedure as presented.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">All were in favour, and the MOTION CARRIED.</p> <p>J. Reddigan to bring the procedure to UGMS, and if approved there, it will be added to the website. Once it is there, E. Winter will notify students.</p>	<p>ACTION: It was moved by V. Curran and seconded by P. Pike to approve the Examination Invigilation Procedure as presented. Motion carried.</p> <p>ACTION: J. Reddigan to bring the procedure to UGMS, and if approved there, it will be added to the website. E. Winter will</p>

			notify students when on website.
#3 STANDING ITEMS	3.1 Phase 1-4 assessment updates (Ph. Assessment Leads)	<p>Phase 1: P. Pike said Phase is complete. D. Deacon still waiting for some assessment results in order to finalize.</p> <p>Phase 2: B. Thiessen not present to report.</p> <p>Phase 3: J. Gill said there was nothing significant to report.</p> <p>Phase 4: N. Duggan not present to report. D. Deacon was to ask E. Hillman for clarification on how to change the progress exam dates in the assessment plan. She was advised that the exam dates could not be changed because the Phase 4 student feedback on changing the date was not unanimous.</p>	ACTION: D. Deacon will leave progress exam dates as is for class of 2020.
3.2 Student matters (Student Representatives)		<p>Phase 1: B. Turner reported on a Phase 1 issue that is also applicable to Phase 2 regarding assignments required to be submitted a few weeks apart. Some students had to reassess for both assignments in the same two-week time period. Students are requesting that more time be provided in cases like these. For example, a number of students failed the Leadership in Medicine assignments and had to reassess within the same two weeks, and there appear to be discrepancies in marking. According to current assessment plan language, students must submit reassessment assignments within two weeks of being notified by UGME that they have to reassess. Could add wording for exceptions to future assessment plans, and with more time allotted at the discretion of Phase Lead. V. Curran to follow up with D. Deacon on wording to bring to UGMS in future assessment plans. D. Deacon to confirm suggested language with M. Nuaaman.</p> <p>Phase 4: Clinic cards and ITARS continue to be problematic. Issue in general on all rotations is that ITARS are not consistent with clinic card feedback except for Psychiatry where comments were copied and pasted from clinic cards. Student may be rated as entrustable for an EPA on the Clinical Clerkship Final Assessment Report for a discipline but not on Core Summative ITAR. Formative feedback discussions are not happening. Checking off they have met with the learners but that's not happening. Coaching is not real coaching, and comments on the ITAR that state they will not be used on the MSPR are</p>	ACTION: V. Curran to follow up with D. Deacon regarding wording in assessment plans regarding extra time given to submit assignments when multiple reassessments are due in same time period. D. Deacon will check wording with M. Nuaaman.

		<p>included on the MSPR. T. Adey suggested an email go out about this as is used on MSPRs and asked for feedback from students. M. Nuaaman said comments should be summarized and words need to be descriptive. EPAs and descriptions aren't done well and are mostly negative. Only entrustable is positive. Not written well. T. Adey said we need more development and training. Students want a succinct, well written description of what happened. Queen's University has students choose 6-8 validated comments to be included on MSPR. Right now, our MSPRs are way too long. M. Nuaaman said students are afraid to disagree with comments, and there are spelling mistakes. T. Adey explained the format of the document does not allow spell check, and some errors are impossible to pick up, but we are looking at ways around this. T. Adey said if students can pick own comments, then these things will be picked up, and that the information to be included in the document needs to be ready for document to make the process more effective.</p> <p>Progress testing: students are frustrated as there are no coaching sessions to go over feedback. Some students emailed to request coaching and were sent references to website with individualized questions. They don't know if progress testing can be rescheduled if necessary as there are no guidelines written. This issue has been raised before but nothing done. No procedure for missing a progress test. An example was given of a student heading to Labrador who emailed for 3 months prior to going to ask if the progress test could be written there but received no answer.</p> <p>The Pediatric clinic card not working as there are not enough patients, and students are essentially shadowing. The assignment associated with the rotation is considered to be a make work project, the Health Advocate essay is not relevant, and has been an issue for the last 2 years.</p> <p>T. Adey explained the Phase 4 Lead position is an overwhelming job which oversees 2 years of students, and an additional person may need to be assigned. Coaching training is also needed with maybe more than one person coaching. V. Curran asked if students could be referred to a CDC for coaching, and T. Adey said the CDCs would have to answer that as they already are responsible for clinic cards. T. Adey has brought the issue of not having people in assessment lead positions to the Dean, and said there needs to be a</p>	<p>ACTION: D. Deacon to follow up with N. Duggan.</p> <p>ACTION: N. Duggan will address clinic card issues with Discipline Chairs.</p> <p>ACTION: V. Curran to organize a meeting to discuss how to address issues and will check</p>
--	--	--	--

		strategizing session to address student issues as well as faculty development and faculty engagement. V. Curran to organize a meeting to come up with a plan to address the issues, and M. Nuaaman said it's urgent to look at this before the next progress test in April. V. Curran to check with Carla to determine who needs to be involved.	with Carla to determine who needs to be involved. ACTION: T. Adey to speak to Dean about unfilled spots again.
3.3 Formative/summative assessment monitoring/evaluation (D. Deacon)	3.3.1 Phase 1 and 3 examination blueprints	D. Deacon presented Phase 1 and 3 examination blueprints and highlighted trends and issues.	
3.4 EPA Project update (Chair)		V. Curran said student surveys and interviews with preceptors and CDCs have been completed, and he will bring a summary of findings to next meeting and upcoming Phase 4 assessment meeting, then forward to next SAS meeting. His team is also collecting EPA scores for statistical analysis. Student evaluation summary will be forwarded for next SAS and for the upcoming Phase 4 meeting.	ACTION: V. Curran to bring student evaluation summary to next meeting as well as to upcoming Phase 4 assessment meeting.
3.5 Curriculum review report (G. McGrath)		G. McGrath presented a report on Curriculum Review and highlighted recommendations regarding segments/components of the curriculum relevant to SAS. V. Curran thanked G. McGrath for the report.	
#4 New Business	4.1 Language re: consequences of not meeting course criteria	T. Adey said this issue came up in an appeals meeting that was held as a result of a promotions decision. The word "fail" is not in the assessment plan, it is implied but not stated. It may be necessary to include the fail wording of calendar item 10.5.2 in the assessment plan. M. Nuaaman suggested the item could be hyper linked in the Student Handbook assessment plan and added into the wording for assessment plans going forward.	ACTION: D. Deacon to add this wording into assessment plans going forward.
Next meeting		Meeting adjourned at 5:40 pm.	