

Student Assessment Sub-Committee			DATE	March 29, 2017
			ROOM	PDCS Room 4
CHAIR	Dr. Vernon Curran, Chair			
MEMBERS: 2015 - 2016	<p><i>Voting members:</i> <i>Dr. Pam Pike, Phase 1 Assessment Lead</i> <i>Dr. Mike Hogan, Phase 2 Assessment Co-Lead</i> <i>Dr. Barton Thiessen, Phase 2 Assessment Co-Lead</i> <i>Dr. Gokul Vidyasankar, Phase 3 Assessment Lead</i> <i>Dr. Jason McCarthy, Phase 4 Lead (Clerkship Coordinator)</i> <i>Mr. Mackenzie Turpin, Phase 1-3 Student</i> <i>Mr. Matthew Quann, Phase 4 Student</i> <i>Dr. Magdalena Lugowski, PARNL Resident</i> <i>Dr. Catherine Mah, Member-at-Large</i> <i>Dr. Craig Moore, Member-at-Large</i></p> <p><i>Ex officio (non-voting) members:</i> <i>Dr. Donald W. McKay, Associate Dean, UGME</i> <i>Dr. Sean Murphy, Chair, UGMS Committee</i> <i>Ms. Gerona McGrath, PESC</i> <i>Ms. Diana Deacon, Educational Specialist, Assessment</i> <i>Mr. Stephen Pennell, Manager, Health Education Technology and Learning</i> <i>Ms. Elas Winter, Support Staff, UGME</i></p>			
PARTICIPANTS	V. Curran, D. McKay, M. Hogan, G. Vidyasankar, C. Moore, P. Pike, M. Lugowski, D. Deacon, M. Quann, M. Turpin, G. McGrath, Dr. J. Hickey			
RECORDING SECRETARY	<i>(Minutes Taped) Transcribed by Carol Vokey</i>			
INVITED GUEST				
REGRETS	S. Murphy, C. Mah, B. Thiessen, J. McCarthy, S. Pennell			
MINUTES				
AGENDA	ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	
WELCOME	The Chair convened the meeting at 1600h.			
#1 REVIEW & APPROVAL OF MINUTES	<p>a) Approval of February 22, 2017 minutes.</p> <p>b) Follow-up on ACTION items from February 22,</p>	<p>The minutes of the February 22, 2017 minutes were reviewed. D. McKay asked for the following edit under #6 Business Arising: "D. McKay said he received the accreditation report this afternoon, and we are compliant with all 12 standards, and we are compliant in 7 of 8 elements that were the subject of a recent status report." C. Vokey will make this change.</p> <p>It was MOVED by P. Pike and SECONDED by G. Vidyasankar to approve the</p>	<p>ACTION: C. Vokey to make suggested edit to the February 22, 2017 minutes.</p> <p>ACTION: It was moved by P.</p>	

	2017 meeting.	<p>minutes of the February 22, 2017 meeting with suggested edit.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">All were in favour and the MOTION CARRIED.</p> <p>i. <u>Phase 4 MED 8710 Assessment Report Response</u>: D. Deacon said the document was circulated, and she has received a response from J. McCarthy. She then highlighted the following from J. McCarthy's Phase 4 report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EPAs will be updated in the coming years to reflect AFMC adoption of Canadian style set of EPAs. After mapping AFMC competencies to AAMC's to identify gaps, they will adopt 12 of the AFMC competencies and add one for interprofessional team work. - NBMEs hopefully to be replaced by progress testing. - Some issues with using EPAs on electives and selectives as all preceptors may not be familiar with assessment tool. Faculty development ongoing. - Feelings of over-assessment. - D. McKay said Pediatrics and Surgery NBME subject exams may not be offered after July 1, and this would cause a potential problem to the assessment plan for MED 8710 as the last cohort may not have these two exams. It will also affect the MSPR's. D. McKay to confirm and send the information to those involved. <p>ii. <u>Phase 4 Independent Projects Rubrics</u>: D. Deacon said feedback was sent to UGME. Changes have been made and they are ready to use.</p> <p>iii. <u>MED 6780 Community Engagement Essay Rubric</u>: D. Deacon circulated it to Committee for comments prior to meeting, and student comments have been forwarded to C. Mah. M. Turpin said students feel their feedback wasn't carried forward, and assignment is even longer than it was before. As C. Mah was not present to discuss today, item will be kept on the agenda for future discussion.</p> <p>iv. <u>Reassessment scheduling UGMS response</u>: V. Curran reported this was brought to UGMS, and it was flagged and noted for future scheduling.</p> <p>v. <u>Volume of assessment and stress</u>: V. Curran had sent out a paper to the Committee on this, and G. McGrath checked course evaluations regarding assessment and related stress and found no defined patterns in recent years.</p>	<p>Pike and seconded by G. Vidyasankar to approve the minutes of the February 22, 2017 meeting. Motion carried.</p> <p>ACTION: D. McKay to confirm the elimination of Pediatrics and Surgery NBME subject exams and forward information to those involved.</p> <p>ACTION: MED 6780 Community Engagement Essay Rubric to remain on agenda for discussion with C. Mah.</p>
#2 PHASE 1 – 4 ASSESSMENT UPDATES	a) Lower limit of Hofstee algorithm (G. Vidyasankar)	<p><u>Phase 1</u>: P. Pike said there were no updates to report.</p> <p><u>Phase 2</u>: M. Hogan said only issue is the timing of reassessments (assessments</p>	

<p>(Assessment Working Group Leads</p>	<p>b) Phase 4 6-month assessment summary (G. McGrath)</p>	<p>being scheduled so close to block exams).</p> <p><u>Phase 3:</u> G. Vidyasankar also commented on timing of reassessment and Block 6 exam.</p> <p>a) He expressed concern regarding the Hofstee algorithm and wondered if the lower marks are sufficient. The Committee discussed this at length, and M. Turpin reported the following student feedback on Block 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - context of exam was very different with added issue of so many snow closures - it was felt that teaching was of lesser quality throughout the entire block - assessment schedule has caused burn out and study pace has suffered - he is not surprised by number of low marks <p>There was discussion on this and it was decided to compile a summary (table) of all Phase 2 and 3 exam results at the end of the Phases this year to isolate issues.</p> <p><u>Phase 4:</u> J. McCarthy not present to report. D. Deacon said Phase 4 is concentrating on mapping of EPAs.</p> <p>b) G. McGrath said K. Stringer (former Clerkship Coordinator) suggested doing a mid-way review that covers the period of August to March of this academic year. Results were presented. There is no Emergency report as it takes place over entire academic year and that will be done in July/August. Other points include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - main theme shows Anesthesia is popular with Clerks but because it is included with Surgery, some feel Surgery time is lessened. Phase 4 team working on this. - Emergency is seen to be disruptive when they are taken out of rotations for it. - NBME remains unpopular assessment tool. - concerns on student living conditions while on Rural rotations. This has gone to UGME for follow up. - overall, the snapshot looks good - learning objectives assessment shows quite an improvement across all rotations from last year. - table speaks to midpoint feedback. Surgery and Pediatrics ratings have dropped and CDC's have been made aware. D. McKay said he is surprised by low numbers as CDC's are usually on top of it. He said feedback numbers will be confirmed by One45. PESC to look at clarifying for students what mid-point evaluation means. 	<p>ACTION: At the end of Phase 2 and 3 this year, D. Deacon will compile a table summarizing all Phase 2 and 3 exam results for this year to isolate issues.</p> <p>ACTION: PESC to look at clarifying for students what mid-point evaluation means.</p>
<p>#3 STUDENT MATTERS</p>		<p>M. Turpin raised the following student concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Phase 2 concern regarding quality of feedback on written professionalism assignment which has no rubric. V. Curran to bring to UGMS for action. D. 	<p>ACTION: De-identified examples of feedback received by students to be collected for</p>

		<p>McKay suggested collecting de-identified examples of feedback for review before bringing the issue to UGMS.</p> <p>2. Phase 2 and 3 students are feeling the pressure of the two/three-week block.</p> <p>3. In Phase 3, both Community Engagement Exams were not great. Environmental Health wasn't as good and required extensive reading outside the lecture and exam questions were drawn from the extra readings instead of lectures. A lot of students felt they did poorly on this exam. Student feedback isn't coming through established mechanism. G. Vidyasankar suggested this be brought to the instructor, and J. Hickey said it should go to UCL for this area. J. Hickey said it is useful for students to feed concerns back to us.</p> <p>4. Problem where students have Clinical Skills summative on same day as a block summative. This only affects a small group of students, but some have had 5 summative assessments in one week. Detailed Clinical Skills exams are not included in the calendar that displays occurrence of exams, and D. McKay said we could look into changing/devising exam deferral rules to help alleviate stress.</p> <p>Peer assessment survey: PESC asked how to best conduct peer assessment, and M. Quann said it may be helpful to look at it in terms of an ILS Session. He also said Environmental Health was a problem last year as well. D. McKay said PESC had suggested in the past that ILS wasn't the right place for peer assessment. M. Quann to send information to V. Curran if there are further developments.</p>	<p>review before V. Curran brings lack of feedback/absence of rubric concern to UGMS with recommendation that a rubric be included.</p> <p>ACTION: M. Quann to send information on peer assessment to V. Curran if there are further developments.</p>
<p>#4 Formative/ Summative Assessment Monitoring/ Evaluation (D. Deacon)</p>	<p>a) Phase 2 and 3 Exam Blueprints</p> <p>b) Phase 2 Clinical Skills II Assessment Report, Class of 2019</p> <p>c) Phase 1 Assessment Reports, Class of 2020</p>	<p>a) D. Deacon reviewed the Phase 2 and 3 Exam Blueprints.</p> <p>b) & c) D. Deacon will send Assessment Reports for Phases 1 and 2 to the Phase Leads and then feedback will come back to Committee.</p>	<p>ACTION: D. Deacon will send Phase 1 and 2 Assessment Reports to the Phase Leads.</p>
<p>#5 Update on EPA Project</p>	<p>App pilot report (S. Pennell, M. Turpin)</p>	<p>S. Pennell was not present, and D. McKay updated the Committee on the EPA app pilot project saying there was low uptake percentage probably because the alternative to use the written cards was available. Likely, for the next pilot there will be no alternative to using the app offered. This pilot will soon end and data will be evaluated before the next pilot rolls out. M. Turpin said most clerks dislike using the app as they felt they were writing too much of the narrative themselves.</p>	

<p>#6 Phase 3 Research Curriculum ethics assignment (J. Hickey)</p>		<p>J. Hickey explained research curriculum issue regarding ethics approval. Some bugs in new process have been identified, one being delays in students obtaining ethics approval which may result in 5 to 10 students without ethics approval. The rubric for this section is based on data collection and analysis, and due to time constraints, we will have to help students complete this successfully. This may require change to assessment plan and existing rubric. After discussion, it was decided J. Hickey will compile full recommendation and bring back for further discussion.</p>	<p>ACTION: J. Hickey to compile recommendation on how to help students overcome research curriculum issues and bring back to SAS for further discussion.</p>
<p>#7 Peer Assessment (V. Curran)</p>		<p>M. Turpin looked at peer assessment survey and brought to other curricular-based student representatives, and student feedback was explained to the Committee and discussed. M. Turpin to email the student feedback and suggestions to V. Curran. D. McKay suggested the students express what they do want with regards to peer assessment as well making changes to survey's introductory paragraph which explains peer assessment process.</p>	<p>ACTION: M. Turpin to email peer assessment feedback and suggestions to V. Curran.</p>
<p>#8 Business Arising</p>		<p>No business arising.</p>	

The meeting adjourned at 1747h, and the next meeting is scheduled to take place on April 26, 2017.