

Student Assessment Sub-Committee		DATE	November 30, 2016
		ROOM	M1M109
<b>CHAIR</b>	Dr. Vernon Curran, Chair		
<b>MEMBERS:</b>  <b>2015 - 2016</b>	<p><i>Voting members:</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Pam Pike, Phase 1 Assessment Lead</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Mike Hogan, Phase 2 Assessment Co-Lead</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Barton Thiessen, Phase 2 Assessment Co-Lead</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Gokul Vidyasankar, Phase 3 Assessment Lead</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Jason McCarthy, Phase 4 Lead (Clerkship Coordinator)</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Mackenzie Turpin, Phase 1-3 Student</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Matthew Quann, Phase 4 Student</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Magdalena Lugowski, PARNL Resident</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Catherine Mah, Member-at-Large</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Craig Moore, Member-at-Large</i></p> <p><i>Ex officio (non-voting) members:</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Donald W. McKay, 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>		
<b>PARTICIPANTS</b>	V. Curran, D. McKay, M. Hogan, C. Mah (call in), C. Moore, P. Pike, D. Deacon, S. Pennell, M. Turpin, G. McGrath		
<b>RECORDING SECRETARY</b>	<b><i>(Minutes Taped) Transcribed by Carol Vokey</i></b>		
<b>INVITED GUEST</b>			
<b>REGRETS</b>	S. Murphy, G. Vidyasankar, B. Thiessen, J. McCarthy, M. Lugowski, M. Quann		
<b>MINUTES</b>			
<b>AGENDA</b>	<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
WELCOME	The Chair convened the meeting at 4:05p.m.		
#1 REVIEW & APPROVAL OF MINUTES	a) Approval of October 26, 2016 minutes.	<p>The minutes of the October 26, 2016 minutes were reviewed.</p> <p>It was <b>MOVED</b> by P. Pike and <b>SECONDED</b> by C. Moore to approve the minutes of the October 26, 2016 minutes as presented.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">All were in favour and the <b>MOTION CARRIED.</b></p>	<b>ACTION: It was moved by P. Pike and seconded by C. Moore to approve the minutes of the October 26, 2016 minutes as presented. Motion carried.</b>

	<p>b) Follow-up on ACTION items from October 26, 2016 meeting.</p>	<p>i. <u>Demonstration of clinic card app</u>: S. Pennell explained the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Three disciplines have volunteered to pilot the app.</li> <li>- He would provide feedback on which reports will be needed. D. Deacon will also help determine this. We will be charged for reports.</li> <li>- Newest version, T-Res 2, has 0 charge for preceptor accounts, but there will be a charge for students to use the app.</li> <li>- Faculty development will be required to assist preceptors. S. Pennell will coordinate this with S. Shorlin.</li> <li>- Going forward, let S. Pennell know if anything is missing.</li> <li>- This app functions on IOS and web browser.</li> </ul> <p>S. Pennell and D. Stokes ran through a demonstration of how the app will work, and V. Curran thanked them for their work.</p> <p>ii. <u>Summative Assessment Procedure for Phase 4 Courses</u>: D. Deacon said this is the latest iteration from the Phase 4 Working Group who reviewed it and approved it with minor edits. V. Curran suggested tabling this item and to bring it back for next meeting to give members the opportunity to review. Any changes should be sent to D. Deacon and V. Curran before next meeting.</p> <p>iii. <u>Approval of Phase 2 Class of 2020 Assessment Plans</u>: D. Deacon said that the plans for MED 6750, MED 6760, and MED 6770 previously approved at SAS have been approved by UGMS.</p>	<p><b>ACTION: Summative Assessment Procedure for Phase 4 Courses tabled until next meeting. Changes should be sent to D. Deacon and V. Curran.</b></p>
<p>#2 Report on Graduate Questionnaire (G. McGrath)</p>		<p>G. McGrath reported on the Graduate Questionnaire as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This is a benchmark year as it is the last year of cohort for students in the old curriculum and the last year for this questionnaire format.</li> <li>- Sent to all graduating medical students in Canada</li> <li>- Our response rate was 87% which is lower than last year but not bad.</li> <li>- Because students self-select, results may not be indicative of the entire student body</li> <li>- Results are taken very seriously by accreditors</li> <li>- Overall, results show that Memorial learners answered most questions in the lower levels of satisfaction compared to national averages.</li> <li>- Next year, the EPA's will play a part in this process.</li> </ul> <p>D. McKay said the questionnaire doesn't serve Canada's needs. It is too long, and questions are opinion-based which make them invalid indicators. Changes are coming for 2018, and the questionnaire will be shorter.</p>	

<p>#3 Phase 1 -4 Assessment Updates (Assessment Working Group Leads)</p>		<p><u>Phase 1</u> - P. Pike said Community Engagement exam to roll out on Monday, and C. Mah said exam was developed following SAS guidelines re ratios (formative vs. summative) with good questions that are representative of the content. Hoping for good performance.</p> <p><u>Phase 2</u> – M. Hogan said assessment plans have been approved except for MED 6780 – Community Engagement II. Some points of note are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- weighting is the same</li> <li>- preceptor grade will be based on a rubric, to be available in d2I</li> <li>- C. Mah said driver of creation of Community Visit Essay relates to last fall re: shift of phases related to rural visits. Phase 1 Community Health component no longer has a rural visit</li> <li>- There had been a concern regarding the high percentage value of an assignment that had a relatively low word limit. After discussion, it was decided to leave as is.</li> <li>- M. Turpin expressed student concerns with Phase 1 and 2 combined essay. Dr. Mah said they will pay attention to the concern and have a detailed explanation in the rubric.</li> </ul> <p>It was <b>MOVED</b> by C. Mah and <b>SECONDED</b> by P. Pike to approve MED 6780 Assessment Plan as presented.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">All agreed and <b>MOTION CARRIED.</b></p> <p><u>Phase 3</u> – G. Vidyasankar not present. D. Deacon said there is nothing outstanding.</p> <p><u>Phase 4</u> – J. McCarthy not present.</p>	<p><b>ACTION: It was moved by C. Mah and seconded by P. Pike to approve MED 6780 Assessment Plan as presented. Motion carried. C. Mah to bring rubric for Community Visit Essay to a future meeting for discussion.</b></p>
<p>#4 Student Matters</p>		<p>M. Turpin expressed the following student concerns:</p> <p><u>Phase 1</u> Community Engagement exam: delay in receiving formative questions. As well, content (required readings plus lecture content) is overwhelming and they feel they will do poorly. Nothing to be done now, but in future look at how much reading is required in addition to lecture content. D. McKay said this should be noted on course evaluations and the concerns should heard by more committees with more power to deal with them (PESC and UGMS). He assured that evaluation forms are given due consideration and that there are protections built into the system. M. Turpin said there were more assessments due in December than September, October and November</p>	

		<p>combined. D. McKay said work can be submitted earlier than the due dates. V. Curran asked if assessment schedules are looked at when doing assessment plans, and D. Deacon said they were.</p> <p><u>Phase 3</u>  M. Turpin explained student concerns regarding tutorial assessment as they feel tutors are not being consistent with material they are testing. He said students have asked for answer keys but they have not been getting them. As a result, many students fear getting answers wrong when exams are based on tutorials. V. Curran said this issue has come up in the past, and D. Deacon said S. Shorlin has been working on tutorial guides. D. Deacon will follow up with S. Shorlin regarding tutorial guides and will ask him to attend next SAS meeting. M. Turpin is to be added to the working group. D. McKay said tutors should have guides. M. Turpin to bring examples of tutorial inconsistencies to next meeting.</p>	<p><b>ACTION: D. Deacon to follow up with S. Shorlin regarding tutorial guides and will invite him to next SAS meeting to address tutorial concern. M. Turpin to be added to working group.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: M. Turpin to bring examples of tutorial inconsistencies to next meeting.</b></p>
#5 Formative/ Summative Assessment Monitoring/ Evaluation	<p>a) Phase 1 &amp; 3 Exam Blueprints</p> <p>b) Phase 4 MED 8710 Assessment Report</p> <p>c) Phase 2 Assessment Reports</p>	<p>a) D. Deacon referenced exam blueprints previously distributed.</p> <p>b) Deferred. D. Deacon to contact J. McCarthy. Hopefully, he can call in during next meeting.</p> <p>c) D. Deacon to send out to faculty for review. SAS to review once we hear back from faculty.</p>	<p><b>ACTION: D. Deacon to contact J. McCarthy re Phase 4 MED 8710 Assessment Report and ask him to call-in for next meeting.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: D. Deacon to send Phase 2 Assessment Reports to faculty for review. SAS to review again after faculty review.</b></p>

<p>#6 Phase 4 Discipline Exams</p>		<p>D. McKay reported on his budget meeting with the Dean:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MCC moving as local office closed. D. McKay has left a message and has had correspondence with counterparts across Country.</li> <li>- Phase 4 has agreed to tell SAS/UGMS they want to do away with National Board exams and implement progress testing at the end of Phase 3, end of Phase 4 MED 8710 and end of medical programme.</li> <li>- Vision is to purchase exam from MCC which is based on MCC objectives and includes clinical decision making questions. This would allow FOM to not have to create 3 exams and would be cheaper than 6 NBME's. This would also free up class time.</li> <li>- Need to get funding from MCC colleagues likewise questions, may be volume discount.</li> <li>- End result should be revenue neutral.</li> <li>- Many benefits includes using Canadian objectives with the right mix of high quality and appropriate questions, there would be 4 to 5 less exams which frees up time. Proactive in helping our students succeed.</li> <li>- This was unanimously approved by Phase 4. V. Curran said Phase 4 proposal to come from J. McCarthy or D. McKay on his behalf.</li> <li>- Likely next year fall of 2017 proposal to be made at a future meeting.</li> </ul>	
<p>#7 Update on EPA Project</p>		<p>D. Deacon said data entered for Surgery is being looked at for statistical analysis. Research group is looking at coded data from faculty focus group and will be reviewed at meeting on December 9. They have started coding clinic card comments and then there will be a similar process with the group. Draft literature review for a potential paper has started. V. Curran said he feels comments from preceptors were not useful for coaching and this will be useful for future faculty development.</p>	
<p>#8 Business Arising</p>		<p>There was no business arising and the meeting adjourned at 5:39 pm.</p>	