

Student Assessment Sub-Committee		DATE	April 29, 2015
		ROOM	PDCS Room 4
CHAIR	Dr. Vernon Curran, Chair		
MEMBERS: 2013 - 2014	<i>Dr. Victor Maddalena, Phase 1 Lead</i> <i>Dr. Lisa Kenny, Phase 2 Lead</i> <i>Dr. Joanne Hickey, Phase 3 Lead</i> <i>Dr. Katherine Stringer, Phase 4 Lead (Clerkship Coordinator)</i> <i>Dr. Amanda Pendergast, 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. Jatin Morkar, Phase 3 Assessment Co-Lead</i> <i>Dr. Gokul Vidyasankar, Phase 3 Assessment Co-Lead</i> <i>Dr. Catherine Mah, Member-at-Large</i> <i>Dr. Jessica Downing, PAIRN Representative</i> <i>Dr. Donald W. McKay, Associate Dean, UGME</i> <i>Dr. Sean Murphy, Chair – UGMS Committee</i> <i>Ms. Diana Deacon, Educational Specialist (MESc)</i> <i>Mr. Stephen Pennell, Manager, Health Education Technology and Learning</i> <i>Mr. Chris Harty – Phase 1-3 Student Representative</i> <i>Ms. Stephanie Power-MacDonald, Clerkship Student Representative</i> <i>Ms. Elas Winter, UGME Support</i>		
PARTICIPANTS	Dr. V. Curran, Ms. D. Deacon, Dr. Barton Thiessen, Mr. Chris Harty, Ms. Gerona McGrath, Dr. Mike Hogan, Ms. Elas Winter		
RECORDING SECRETARY	<i>(Minutes Taped)</i>		
INVITED GUEST			
REGRETS	Dr. Don McKay, Dr. Jatin Morkar, Dr. Katherine Stringer, Dr. Amanda Pendergast, Dr. Gokul Vidyasankar, Mr. Steve Pennell		
MINUTES			
AGENDA	ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
WELCOME	The Chair convened the meeting at 4:00 p.m.		
#1 REVIEW & APPROVAL OF MINUTES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Item 1.a Approval of March 25, 2015 Minutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deferred until next meeting 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Item 1.b Follow-up on action items - Summative Assessment Procedures for Phases 1 - 3 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A discussion took place regarding the current system for reviewing wrong answers and the need to set a reasonable time limit. The Chair stated that there is no evidence-based standard to refer to and it is something that would have to be discussed with the Undergrad office. A solution may be to remove the term 'private' from the procedures which would allow for group review. Ms. Deacon advised that she received suggestions from SAS members regarding style and edits, which have been incorporated into the document. The Chair stated that we will await Dr. McKay's response regarding the 'private' term and aim to finalize and send to Undergrad by next week. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACTION: Dr. Curran will email Dr. McKay to see if the term 'private' can be taken out to allow for a group review.
#2 Accreditation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No report. 	
#3 Phase I, II & III Assessment Updates (Assessment WG Leads)	Phase I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No report for Phase I. 	
	Phase II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dr. Thiessen, Phase 2 Co-Lead, reported that they are trying to improve the 55% fail rate. There was an issue around the 30% rule for remedial exams and the goal should be to move that higher and have it the same across all phases. It was felt that a reasonable goal would be 70% new questions on a remedial exam, which could be accomplished over 3 years. 	
	Phase III	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No report for Phase III. 	
#4 Clerkship Assessment Updates (K. Stringer)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deferred until next meeting 	

<p>#5 Student Issues</p>	<p>OSCE Assessment questions</p> <p>Challenge card updates</p> <p>Exam questions using "except" language</p> <p>Question Mark Software issue</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students had some questions recently on a Clinical Skills exam which came as a surprise. For example there was a question on prenatal history in a Pediatrics class, which would be more appropriate as an OBS/GYN question. The idea came up of providing a rubric to students so they would know what to study and how they would be evaluated. Currently there are checklists but students are sometimes confused about covering all points on the checklist, especially for history questions. It was felt that it would be good feedback for the class to give on the course evaluation. • One student mentioned that none of the challenges were looked at and the same questions show up on the rewrite. Mr. Harty was reassured that every single challenge card is looked at, but only so many will lead to a change. If 80% of the class gets a question right then the Assessment Committee may decide it's not worth going back to the instructor. Regarding transparency, Mr. Harty was advised that challenges will go up on the web after UGME gives approval. • The Chair suggested we do a summary for a recent exam that had challenge cards showing the item stats, i.e. give the number of challenges for each item and the percentage of the class getting it right. Mr. Harty indicated this would really help the students. • Students are still finding instances where the guidelines for correct phrasing are not being followed and the 'except' language is still used. Mr. Harty was advised that there may not be enough questions banked or the instructor may not have been able to change the format of the question. When such questions are flagged, they are immediately looked at and in some cases Dr. McKay may get involved to address the issue with the instructor. • Mr. Harty advised that at least 3 students had the right answer selected but somehow got it marked wrong. Elis advised that some components have to be manually inputted into each individual student's file and then the software calculates. There is room for 	<p>ACTION: Gerona will ensure Clerkship Committee is made aware.</p> <p>ACTION: Ms. Deacon will prepare an item summary for the next meeting.</p> <p>ACTION: This matter will continue to be attended to when discussing exams and exam language and when problems are encountered, work with faculty members to rewrite.</p>
--------------------------	--	--	--

	Phase 4 Academic Half-Day Assessment	<p>inputting error. However, whenever a student gets a fail mark, she will review the file to ensure that no inputting errors were made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students are concerned that previously taught pre-clerkship material is now moving to Phase 4 and will be taught either on academic half-days or an additional afternoon. Their concern is two-fold: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Students are anxious about being assessed on additional material 2) Would like to get list of material objectives and perhaps some direction before actually starting Phase 4 in August. Also is this going to take away from academic half-day time? <p>Ms. Deacon advised she is aware of the upcoming change. However, she is not aware of the nature and extent of it.</p> <p>It was suggested that this matter be brought up in the Clerkship meeting scheduled for May 21st. Mr. Harty will email Dr. Kath Stringer, with copy to SAS, to ask that this matter be put on the agenda for that meeting.</p>	
#6 Formative/ Summative Assessment Monitoring/ Evaluation	a. Reports from Education Specialist (Diana Deacon)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No report. 	
	b. Responses to reports from Course Chairs/Phase Leads (Diana Deacon) - Phase 2 course assessment report responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No report received on Phase 2. Dr. Lisa Keney has been sent a reminder. Blueprints had been distributed and Dr. Thiessen, Phase 2 Co-Lead, acknowledged he had seen them. 	
	c. Quality Review of Assessment Tools/Instruments (Diana Deacon)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing new to report. 	

	d. Phase 2 and 3 Exam Blueprints (Diana Deacon)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed Phase 2 Block 02 and Phase 3 Block 05 exam blueprints. • Blueprints are up to date with the latest exam. 	
#7 Business Arising			
Adjournment		The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.	