



Student Assessment Sub-Committee Minutes

Wednesday, November 24, 2021, 4:00 pm
via WebEx

Attendees: H. Coombs, V. Curran, S. Drodge, N. Duggan, C. Langmead, M. Najafizada, S. Pennell, R. Perrier, P. Pike, C. Pye, M. Wahl, E. Winter, K. Zipperlen,

Guest: B. Kerr

Regrets (in alphabetical order): T. Adey, E. Maxwell, S. Reid

Topic	Details	Action items and person responsible
Introduction and Welcome	V. Curran welcomed the group.	Call to order at 4:05 pm
Agenda review -Review for COI -Confirmation of Agenda	No COI declared. Agenda was changed slightly to discuss these items first: -Accreditation monitoring report -Anatomy assessment plan -EPA assessment working group report	
Review and approval of September 22, 2021 minutes	No quorum of members who were present at September meeting. Unable to formally approve September minutes. Minutes will be posted as "unofficial".	
Review and approval of October 24, 2021 minutes	N. Duggan and C. Langmead were omitted and K. Zipperlen will add them to list of attendees for this meeting. <i>It was MOVED by N. Duggan and SECONDED by C. Langmead to approve the October 4, 2021 minutes as presented. MOTION CARRIED.</i>	ACTION: K. Zipperlen will add N. Duggan and C. Langmead to list of attendees for the October 24, 2021 meeting.
1. Business arising		
1.1 Action items from June 23, 2021 meeting:		
Action items from April 28, 2021 meeting: ACTION: S. Pennell and K. Zipperlen to look at next steps regarding possibility of using Navigate to monitor academic progress in Phase 1 to 3. <u>Update:</u> K. Zipperlen explained Navigate is a learner support system used on main campus, but we would use it as a formalized electronic tracking system to track learner progress such as reassessments and record meeting notes. K. Zipperlen said they were ready to implement but there was some hold up with the privacy office.		ACTION: Ongoing
ACTION: EPA Assessment Working Group to discuss current e-clinic card process and provide update. <u>Update:</u> K. Zipperlen to report on this later in the meeting.		ACTION: Ongoing
ACTION: K. Zipperlen will ask S. Pennell and his group about the use of more clinical decision-making questions on exams in Phases 1-3 and bring back to next meeting. Keep on agenda for future review.		ACTION: Defer to future meeting.
ACTION: K. Zipperlen to look at onboarding for new SAS members to ensure compliance with accreditation standards. <u>Update:</u> K. Zipperlen and M. Wahl working on this.		ACTION: Ongoing



Student Assessment Sub-Committee Minutes

Wednesday, November 24, 2021, 4:00 pm
via WebEx

<p>ACTION: K. Zipperlen to develop template for formative question explanation. Share with Phase leads and BMS to encourage and promote providing explanation for formative exam questions.</p> <p>K. Zipperlen wondered about method for learners to contact instructors. M. Wahl said instructors should encourage learners to reach out to them with questions to get an explanation, as they felt it was a lot of work to write everything out. Sharing answers with the rest of the class would be beneficial as well. R. Perrier agreed with that approach.</p> <p><u>Update:</u> K. Zipperlen and M. Wahl will discuss further.</p>	<p>ACTION: Ongoing</p>
<p>Action Items from September 22, 2021 meeting</p>	
<p>2.3.1 Phase 2 course assessment reports (Class of 2024)</p> <p>Learners would like more feedback, and Zipperlen will talk to S. Shorlin about working with E. Winter on TA training.</p> <p><u>Update:</u> K. Zipperlen said this was moving forward, S. Shorlin to produce a short instruction video</p>	<p>ACTION: Ongoing</p>
<p>Action Items from October 27, 2021 meeting</p>	
<p>ACTION: K. Zipperlen will email Phase Leads to remind learners about proper use of challenge cards.</p>	<p>ACTION: Complete</p>
<p>2. Standing Items</p>	
<p><u>2.1 PHASE 1-4 ASSESSMENT UPDATES</u></p> <p><u>Phase 1:</u> P. Pike said there were no major updates for Phase 1. In process of recent exam review. Question review going well, mostly. Instructors responding quickly to question review and responsive to suggestions for edits.</p> <p><u>Phase 2:</u> Phase 2 Assessment Lead position still vacant.</p> <p><u>Phase 3:</u> S. Drodge provided written feedback that there needs to be a process to track and flag faculty/ questions with issues (eg: not enough questions, poorly written questions, faculty not responding to emails for new questions or the need to edit questions). Otherwise, things going well with weekly meetings and faculty are responding quickly after exams (giving a 24hr timeline).</p> <p><u>Phase 4:</u> N. Duggan said there were no issues to report.</p> <p><u>2.2 STUDENT MATTERS</u></p> <p><u>Phase 1-3:</u> C. Langmead raised no issues.</p> <p><u>Phase 4:</u> C. Langmead raised no issues on behalf of E. Maxwell.</p> <p><u>2.3 ASSESSMENT MONITORING AND EVALUATION</u></p> <p>2.3.1 Accreditation monitoring report</p>	<p>ACTION: Discuss feedback by S. Drodge at upcoming SAS meeting.</p>



Student Assessment Sub-Committee Minutes

Wednesday, November 24, 2021, 4:00 pm
via WebEx

<p>B. Kerr said the mock accreditation takes place December 7 and 8, and although SAS was not targeted, the site visit team may want to meet when it reviews data. Accreditation takes place on April 4-6, 2022 with a follow-up visit on May 11. B. Kerr thanked K. Zipperlen for completing the DCI (Data Collection Instrument) on behalf of SAS, and presented the annual accreditation monitoring report. He highlighted an issue with the timely submission of final grades for Core Experiences for Class of 2022 where the percent of learners within 6 weeks compliance is very low for the disciplines of Internal Medicine, Obstetrics/ Gynecology, Pediatrics and LIC. B. Kerr suggested this be brought to UGMS. N. Duggan said they have pinpointed the issue of block ITARS being completed too late and are working to resolve it. V. Curran will present this table at UGMS, and K. Zipperlen will copy table into UGMS report.</p> <p>2.3.2 Phase Lead response to Phase 3 course assessment reports Tabled until next SAS meeting.</p> <p>2.3.3 Core Experiences course assessment report Tabled until next SAS meeting.</p> <p>2.3.4 Exam blueprints Phases 1 and 3 Tabled until next SAS meeting.</p>	<p>ACTION: K. Zipperlen will copy the relevant table regarding timely summative assessment into report for the next UGMS meeting where V. Curran will present.</p>
3. New Business	
<p>3.1 EPA assessment working group report N. Duggan summarized the report's recommendations for improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -feedback loop was not happening to show learners are getting timely feedback, and cards are not written properly -learners are not receiving adequate and actionable feedback -concerns that information isn't valid as it is learner lead -formative feedback is being used to make summative decisions -work flow concerns <p>B. Kerr suggested waiting to see what the mock accreditation brings out, and N. Duggan said the Phase 4 management team is aware of the issues and are working on them. V. Curran thanked all involved for their work on this document and suggested using 45 minutes of the December meeting to discuss the report, ask questions for clarification and develop ideas on moving forward.</p> <p>3.2 Phase 2 anatomy assessment K. Zipperlen explained in Phase 1 they switched to a practical exam, and the proposal for Phase 2 is to assess labs through 3 practical exams on individual content areas. She noted concerns from A. Haynes (Faculty Curriculum Lead) about fitting practical exams and reassessments into already tight schedule and impacts of increasing number of assessments during phase. M. Wahl indicated practical exams are the standard for assessing anatomy content at other medical schools. The practical exam in Phase 1 was the first time delivering</p>	



Student Assessment Sub-Committee Minutes

Wednesday, November 24, 2021, 4:00 pm
via WebEx

<p>it and they ran into issues that if someone did not pass the practical, it was challenging to reassess in a timely manner. In addition, the mark was comprised of the practical and the bell ringer portion combined. Now they would like to separate the assessments. C. Langmead said she has heard concerns from the Class of 2025 about the practical exams (number of questions, identification of structure and function, embedding the practical exam into lab time). V. Curran and K. Zipperlen had consulted with H. Jackman (Phase 2 Lead) and A. Haynes (Faculty Curriculum Lead) and inquired if a possible solution could be to assess the anatomy lab content via group presentation and MCQ on the theme exams. M. Wahl said practical exams are preferred from anatomist perspective and learners should know feedback was received and noted. H. Coombs said a QI session with Phase 1 learners yesterday showed they find learning with specimens more helpful than images and photographs.</p> <p>After discussion, the consensus by the committee was to keep the practical exams, and for reassessment, they could use MCQs. N. Duggan said makes sense for this year, but maybe there is another solution for next year. B. Kerr said more thought and planning in advance of draft schedules would be beneficial. K. Zipperlen confirmed it was ok to have the practical exam and the reassessment on the same day. She will share feedback from committee with A. Haynes.</p> <p>Peer assessment K. Zipperlen brought forward the suggestion that the peer assessment form terminology be changed to use inclusive pronouns (they/them instead of him/her). As well, narrative feedback should use different terminology such as changing “weakness” to more positive wording like “areas for improvement”. All members agreed with these changes.</p>	<p>ACTION: K. Zipperlen will advise A. Haynes of results of the discussion on anatomy assessment.</p>
<p>Next Meeting: Next scheduled meeting is December 22, 2021.</p>	<p>ACTION: K. Zipperlen to send meeting reminder and include EPA assessment report for review prior to discussion at December meeting.</p> <p>Adjourned at 5:35 pm.</p>