



Program Evaluation Subcommittee (PESC)
Chair: Dr. Alan Goodridge
Minutes

Tuesday, September 20th, 2022
12:30 – 2:00 pm WebEx Virtual Meeting

Attendees: Dr. Alan Goodridge (Chair), Dr. Sandra Cooke-Hubley, Dr. Heidi Coombs, Dawn Curran, Dr. Norah Duggan, Dr. Ryan Elliott, Dr. Jasbir Gill, Atena Goudarzi, Dr. Taryn Hearn, Dr. Bruce Sussex, Katrin Zipperlen

Regrets: Dr. Amanda Fowler

Topic	Details	Action Items
Welcome	A. Goodridge welcomed new members to the meeting and invited all members to introduce themselves.	
Agenda	Review for Conflict of Interest: no conflict of interest was disclosed. Review/Confirmation of the Agenda: approved with no additions.	
Meeting Notes	There were no minutes for the last meeting since there was no quorum. The meeting notes have been circulated for the committee's consideration.	
Reports	J. Gill presented the <u>Phase 3 Course Evaluation Reports</u> . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response rates were low in almost all evaluations (8%- 7/83) A. Goodridge noted that we never reached a response rate of more than 50%. It was common to get 20 or 25 percent in the last few years. Now it is below 10%, which is discouraging. Review and Approval of report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Moved: J. Gill - Seconded: B. Sussex - All in Favor 	ACTION: H. Coombs to revise the reports and correct the errors. ACTION: J. Gill to send evaluation reports to the course coordinators. ACTION: J. Gill to inform R. Russell and M. Simms about the research curriculum feedback.
Curriculum Review	A. Goodridge presented the Undergraduate Curriculum Review (2022) Terms of Reference: PESC initiates a review of the whole curriculum at least once every 4-6 years under the direction of UGMS. The 2022-2023 academic year	

Our Vision: Through excellence, we will integrate education, research and social accountability to advance the health of the people and communities we serve.

	<p>marks the fourth year since the last curriculum review in, so this is the time to undertake a full curriculum review.</p> <p>The Undergraduate Curriculum Review (2022) Team will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair of PESC (Chair) • Education Specialist (Program Evaluation) • Undergraduate Curriculum Lead • Undergraduate Curriculum and Accreditation Advisor • Education Specialist (Assessment) • Manager of Health Education Technology & Learning • Representative from HSIMS • 1-2 Members-at-Large • Phase 4 (Post-Core) Student Representative • Recent MUN Postgraduate Representative 	<p>ACTION: H. Coombs to add an objective about exploring the impact of training duration on the assessment process.</p> <p>ACTION: H. Coombs to change the 6th objective from “year 4” to "Phase 4.”</p>
Learner Representation	<p>D. Curran – nothing to report.</p> <p>R. Elliott – noted that student’s lack of response might be due to survey fatigue and we would likely to get quality feedback if there were fewer surveys.</p>	
Updates	<p>Phase 1 – S. Cooke-Hubley noted that one of the students was expected to conduct an unsupervised history and physical. Preceptors should be reminded of reasonable expectations of clerks.</p> <p>Phase 2 – A. Fowler was not present.</p> <p>Phase 3 – J. Gill had nothing else to report.</p> <p>Phase 4 – N. Duggan had nothing to report.</p> <p>UGME – T. Hearn sent regrets.</p>	
New Business	<p>Faculty Evaluation Forms</p> <p>H. Coombs noted that there have been some changes to the Faculty Evaluation forms based on guidelines from the University.</p> <p>Memorial suspended its course evaluation process because there was significant bias against female faculty and BIPOC faculty. The University conducted a review of the process and released guidelines for wording on the forms that might mitigate against these biases. The new wording is intended to collect constructive information about learning experiences in courses, rather than measures of teaching effectiveness.</p> <p>In addition, H. Coombs reworded the statement at the beginning of the form to remind students that they are expected to be professional and respectful in their feedback.</p> <p>These are the new questions on the forms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was clear to me what I was expected to learn from this instructor’s session(s). • I achieved the learning objectives for this instructor’s session(s). 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The material in this instructor’s session(s) was presented in a way that helped me learn. • My knowledge of the subject area improved from attending this instructor’s session(s). • I felt there was a respectful learning environment during this instructor’s session(s). 	
	<p>Low Response Rates Postponed to the next meeting.</p>	
	<p>Mid-Point Evaluation for Phase 3 Postponed to the next meeting.</p>	
	<p>New Process for Quality Improvement Postponed to the next meeting.</p>	
	<p>Meeting adjourned at 1:55 PM</p>	

Next Meeting: October 18th, 2022 – WebEx