

## **Phase 2 Management Team**

**April 13, 2015**

**1600- 1730**

**M2M240**

**Minutes**

**Present:** Dr. Lisa Kenny (Chair), David Stokes, Diana Deacon, Dr. Barton Thiessen, Carla Peddle, Chris Harty, Dr. Lesley Turner, Dr. Vereesh Gadag, Dr. Kirsty Tompkins, Dr. Pushpa Sathya, Vivian Whelan.

**Regrets:** Gerona McGrath, Dr. Kath Stringer, Dr. Maria Goodridge, Dr. Mike Hogan, Juanita Barrett.

### **1.0. Review/Approval of Agenda**

No new items.

### **2.0. Review/Approval minutes from March 2, 2015**

Motion to approve: Lesley Turner

2<sup>nd</sup>: Vereesh Gadag

All in favour.

### **3.0. Business Arising**

### **4.0. Standing Items**

#### **4.1. Assessment**

##### **4.1.1. Phase 2 Assessment update**

- Performance on the first 2 summative assessments was concerning. Performance on summative 2 was improved but still concerning.
- All stakeholders are exploring the root cause of the poor performance. The possible reasons discussed, the pass mark has been effectively raised to 75%, anatomy has been moved to phase 2 and summative 1 was felt to be very content dense.
- Assessment has been challenging however the phase 2 assessment group has been following the same rigorous process.
- Dr Barton Thession outlined the process and challenges faced.
- When questions meet the review trigger most faculty feel that their questions are fair.
- Reassessment has at least 30% new questions.
- The maximum grade attainable on reassessment is reassessment is 75%.
- The students strongly feel that the UGMS required pass mark is too high.
- Action : Students who fail reassessment, must meet with Ms. Deanne Williams, Wellness Coordinator and the Phase Lead.

##### **4.1.2. SAS Report**

6750: Patient Course:

- Performance was very good. Block totals were good. The final overall mean is 83.4% for the course. The mean does not include reassessments.
- The number of items credited is 2 or 3 on most.
- The number of items adjusted (partially credited) is fairly consistent.

- The summary of item analysis indicates that except for one exam, the second exam, the mean difficulty for the items was 75% or above and the second exam was 74%. The difficulty rating is how many students got the question wrong – the lower the rating, the more difficult the question. Challenge cards are included.
  - Evaluation data was also reviewed. Assessment and reassessment dates are needed before the Phase starts.
- 
- Clinical Skills – performance was quite good.
  - 28 students got exemplary performance in clinical skills.
  - Mean rating is 4.1 out of 5.0.
  - An OSCE has been added to the Phase II assessment plan.
- 
- Community Engagement – students did well – overall mean of 88.2%.
  - They rated it 3.7 out of 5.0 for the effectiveness of the assessment.
  - Evaluation data was reviewed. The preceptors completed an evaluation of the handbook. They gave ratings out of 5.0 from 3.9 to 4.6 for their usefulness in attaining the educational goals of the students.
  - Most students feel assignments are inconsistent between markers.
  - Issues with the profile have been addressed.
  - Most students found the handbook useful.
- 
- Special Projects – mean rating of 3.8 out of 5.0.
  - Evaluation data. There were very few comments. The students said they would like to have clearer direction for the poster presentation and the feedback panels in the IPST.
  - Overall mean for all of the assessment pieces was 90.9%.

#### 4.2. Evaluation

- Deferred

#### 4.3. ILS/Life-Long Learning

- The stem creation process is challenging but nearing completion.
- Slight modification of the ILS schedule suggested by Dr Sathya. She feels it is not necessary to split feedback into equal time unit for medical expert and non-medical expert. The discussion would be more flexible.
- There are two assignments that the students have to do throughout the term. These assignments need to be graded. We have received assistance with grading those papers.

#### 4.4. Special Projects/Physician Competencies

- Special Projects will be renamed to Physician Competencies.
- The new structure for Independent Projects has been approved in principle by UGMS.
- The new independent project curriculum will have a standardized research curriculum. Students will be matched with mentors. This will apply to the class of 2019. The new curriculum will be offered to the current Phase 2 students.
- The independent project curriculum was reviewed.
- For this iteration of Phase 2, we are recommending that student start or continue on the new curriculum pathway. Our goal is to get the current Phase 2 students on the standardized pathway if it is appropriate.

#### 4.5. Teaching/Learning Methods

- No formal update from the teaching and Learning working group.
- Teaching and Learning grant application current open.
- The following is an example of a current active teaching and learning project. In the first iteration of Phase 1, in the histology class, students completed a 1 hour lecture followed by a two hour lab in which student took turns looking into microscopes. There was a lot of time wasted. Slides were placed in on on-line format. Histology has a 1 hour lecture and a one hour in-class tutorial.
- In the phase system there are now approximately 12-15 hours of teaching methods that have changed.

#### 4.6. Student Issues

- Need Phase 2 student reps.
- There have been two QI sessions to date.
- Issues that students have are faculty having too much content in a short period of time. There needs to be a formal process to ensure this issue is addressed.
- We need the role of Content Experts to be formally recognized with specific responsibilities outlined.

*Action: Lisa Kenny will meet with the Content Leads.*

**6.0 Date Next Meeting:** May 4, 2015