

<b>Student Assessment Sub-Committee</b>		DATE	April 24, 2019
		ROOM	OPED Meeting Rm. 5
<b>CHAIR</b>	Dr. Vernon Curran, Chair		
<b>MEMBERS:</b>  <b>2018-2019</b>	<p><i>Voting members:</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Pam Pike, Phase 1 Assessment Lead</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Barton Thiessen, Phase 2 Assessment Lead</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Jasbir Gill, Phase 3 Lead (until Phase 3 Assessment Lead is appointed)</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Norah Duggan, Phase 4 Lead</i></p> <p><i>Ms. Brooke Turner, Phase 1-3 Student</i></p> <p><i>Ms. Mais Nuaaman, Phase 4 Student</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Jeremy Loh, PARNL Resident</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Craig Moore, Member-at-Large</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Maisam Najafizada, Member-at-Large</i></p> <p><i>Ex officio (non-voting) members:</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Tanis Adey, 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> <p><i>Ms. Carol Vokey, Support Staff, UGME</i></p>		
<b>PARTICIPANTS</b>	V. Curran, B. Thiessen, N. Duggan, L. MacMillan (for B. Turner), M. Nuaaman, G. McGrath, D. Deacon, S. Pennell		
<b>RECORDING SECRETARY</b>	<i>(Minutes Taped) Transcribed by Carol Vokey</i>		
<b>INVITED GUEST</b>			
<b>REGRETS</b>	P. Pike, J. Gill, J. Loh, C. Moore, M. Najafizada, T. Adey, S. Murphy		
<b>MINUTES</b>			
<b>AGENDA</b>	<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
WELCOME	The Chair convened the meeting at 1605h.		
1.0 REVIEW & APPROVAL OF AGMINUTES	1.1 Review and approval of agenda.	The agenda was approved.	

	1.2 Review and approval of January 30, 2019 minutes.	<p>The minutes of the March 27, 2019 meeting were reviewed. V. Curran asked D. Deacon to check to see if minutes are up to date on the website.</p> <p>It was <b>MOVED</b> by B. Thiessen and <b>SECONDED</b> by N. Duggan to approve the March 27, 2019 minutes as presented.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">All were in favour, and the <b>MOTION CARRIED</b>.</p>	<p><b>ACTION: It was moved by B. Thiessen and seconded by N. Duggan to approve the minutes of the March 27, 2019 meeting as presented. Motion carried.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: D. Deacon to check to see if SAS minutes are up to date on the website.</b></p>
2.0 BUSINESS ARISING	Action items from March 27, 2019 meeting	<p>D. Deacon to confirm with S. Shorlin that residents who are preceptors are taught how to complete clinic cards in the Resident Teaching Skills Workshop.</p> <p>PESC is looking at changes to MED 8710 evaluation forms. G. McGrath and L. MacMillan are working with O. Heath on this.</p> <p>V. Curran met with D. Deacon, N. Fairbridge, N. Duggan, T. Adey, C. Peddle, S. Williamson, and M. Nuaaman to discuss Phase 4 assessment issues and reviewed preliminary findings on the EPA Clinic Card project. N. Duggan has attended 2 Discipline Chair meetings re faculty development and she will be holding sessions in New Brunswick as well.</p> <p>D. Deacon will check with T. Adey to see if ads were circulated for vacant positions of Phase 4 Assessment Lead and APC Chair.</p> <p>D. Deacon to add the wording around “fail” from the calendar item 10.5.2 into assessment plans going forward. D. Deacon to look into language from the Calendar and changes will be incorporated into new assessment plans.</p> <p>D. Deacon is working on assessment maps for review at May SAS meeting. She has met with J. Gill and has reached out to A. Pendergast and N. Duggan. Time will be an issue in order to get approval before the beginning of the next academic year. D. Deacon has also been in contact with A. Haynes and B. Kerr</p>	<p><b>ACTION: D. Deacon confirmed with S. Shorlin that resident preceptors receive training on how to complete clinic cards in the Resident Teaching Skills Workshop.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: Ongoing</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: Ongoing</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: Ongoing</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: Ongoing. D. Deacon has to check with T. Adey regarding professionalism.</b></p>

		<p>regarding changes as a result of new “theme based” curriculum that may impact exams in the fall. S. Pennell said realignment is going very well. M. Nuaaman said it’s challenging for learners to not have assessment plans in the first week of classes.</p> <p>G. McGrath to follow up with S. Pennell on how the Student Success Collaborative can be used to fulfill Recommendation #3 of the Curriculum Review regarding implementation of a periodic review system for all students and will update the Committee at next meeting.</p>	<p><b>ACTION: S. Pennell said the program is being rolled out campus-wide, and we are on their list.</b></p>
3.0 STANDING ITEMS	3.1 Phase 1-4 assessment updates (Phase Assessment Leads)	<p><u>Phase 1</u> – P. Pike wasn’t present to report.</p> <p><u>Phase 2</u> – B. Thiessen said students are on break now. They have had 4 exams with 5 to 6 people needing to reassess for each. Anatomy has asked them to look at moving material from Block 5 to Block 6 in order to assess all head and neck topics in the same block. This will result in enough of a change in hours to change weighting of exams. D. Deacon said they have met with H. Jackman on this, and B. Thiessen said the movement towards themes doesn’t affect this. N. Duggan spoke about a CCME session she attended re intermittent vs block lectures showing that learners have a better rate of long term retention of knowledge if they have intermittent lectures, and has suggested the presenters come do the session for Memorial. Studies show that more frequent exams equalled better marks and long term retention of knowledge which is the opposite of a theme based curriculum. D. Deacon to look at overall weighting of each exam and will check with E. Hillman to see if changes have detrimental implications. Both learners said if they would prefer to keep as it.</p> <p><u>Phase 3</u> – J. Gill not present. D. Deacon said she isn’t aware of any issues.</p> <p><u>Phase 4</u> – N. Duggan said just had last formative progress test, but she hasn’t analyzed it completely yet. There were no marks lower than the pass mark. She will send out suggestions for preparation based on what she’s learned in a CCME workshop. The next exam will be summative in mid-July. APC is complete, and she is waiting for preceptors to submit final ITARS. She is looking at setting dates for the progress test baseline assessment for Class of 2021 in June as these dates are needed for the assessment plan.</p>	<p><b>ACTION: D. Deacon to look at overall weighting of each exam in Blocks 5 and 6 and will check with E. Hillman to see if changes have detrimental implications.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: N. Duggan to send out suggestions to learners to prepare for the mid-July summative progress test.</b></p>

	3.2 Learner Matters	<p>L. MacMillan had no issues to discuss from Phases 1 to 3.</p> <p>M. Nuaaman said students received progress test marks yesterday, and the class average stayed the same or dropped compared to the last exam in December. People are disappointed they weren't improving. Some dropped significantly and are worried about the final exam. Some learners are very angry as they feel they haven't gotten the individualized coaching they were promised with progress testing, and they would like to sit with someone to develop a learning plan to improve. N. Duggan said they are trying to develop resources for students who are really below average and asked L. MacMillan and M. Nuaaman to poll students informally regarding their preference of block exams vs. progress testing. M. Nuaaman said it's hard to prepare for the tests while on a heavy service rotation. V. Curran suggested N. Duggan treat progress testing as a pilot project for next year, and she said she would be happy to pilot it again and continue evaluating. N. Duggan continues to encourage MCC to provide LCME exams and that should happen in another couple of years.</p>	<p><b>ACTION: N. Duggan asked L. MacMillan and M. Nuaaman to poll students informally regarding their preference of block exams vs. progress testing.</b></p>
	3.3 Formative/ summative assessment monitoring/evaluation	<p><u>3.3.1 Phase 2 and 3 examination blueprints</u> D. Deacon reviewed Phase 2 and 3 examination blueprints.</p> <p><u>3.3.2 Phase 1 course assessment report responses</u> D. Deacon received response back from A. Pendergast and comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Decent rating given for MCQ exams, management team is proposing for this coming year that the first summative exam have a reassessment as a benefit to learners. They plan to have 4 exams, but that may be changed by Curriculum Oversight Working Group recommendation.</li> <li>- Lifelong learning assignment rating is still below 3.5 out of 5.0 but has some improvement from last year. S. Shorlin to meet with TA's who are involved with grading assignments and provide them with examples to ensure consistency with grading, and rubrics will be reviewed as well to ensure they are matching the description of the project. D. Deacon will follow up with A. Pendergast to see if she will be reaching out to S. Shorlin to do this.</li> <li>- In Clinical Skills had a good rating on assessment, no proposed changes for 2019, and there won't be an OSCE. D. Deacon has been talking with M. Goodridge about changing the standard setting of the Phase 3 OSCE.</li> </ul>	<p><b>ACTION: D. Deacon to follow up with A. Pendergast regarding ensuring with S. Shorlin that rubrics match the description of the project.</b></p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Physician Competencies received a rating of 3.6/5. Learners suggested altering biostats/epi exam back to a take home exam. This was discussed with UCL and faculty, and they would prefer the existing exam as the take-home format encourages group work rather than an independent assessment. M. Nuaaman said she is not in favour of moving back to an assignment because you have to eventually get used to doing the questions.</li> <li>- Community Engagement: students didn't like the assessment overall which was primarily due to an issue with the MCQ exam and miscommunication regarding required reading. This was discussed with M. Najafizada (CE lead), and exam questions will be internally reviewed and revised as well to ensure required reading will be posted on d2l in a timely manner. L. MacMillan received feedback that learners would rather a written assignment instead of written exam.</li> </ul>	
4. New Business	4.1 Online alternative for challenge cards (D. Deacon)	<p>D. Deacon, F. Hammond, J. Kirby and E. Winter met a week ago re learner request to have electronic challenge cards and their concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This would involve using comments box after each question which would result in losing the preamble to guide students to good challenges.</li> <li>- Primary concern is that it would lead to a huge increase in challenges. S. Pennell said it could be a volume they cannot handle. Challenge card format was changed last year to cut down on volume. B. Theissen said legibility on the written cards is always a struggle, and D. Deacon said electronic challenge cards would be good for tracking stats. N. Duggan asked how many questions are thrown out as a result of challenge cards, and B. Thiessen said it's very rare with 1 or 2 per exam at the most. It was agreed to pilot the process in an upcoming exam and report back to the Committee. E. Winter would have to explain the new procedure to students at the beginning of the exam. S. Pennell will check with J. Kirby to see when the next suitable exam will be.</li> </ul> <p>V. Curran mentioned that the Ottawa Conference on assessment is taking place in Winter 2020 in Malaysia. The call for abstracts for oral presentations, poster presentations and conference workshops opens on April 30, 2019 and closes on September 15, 2019.</p>	<b>ACTION: S. Pennell to check with J. Kirby to determine the next exam suitable to pilot the use of electronic challenge cards.</b>
NEXT MEETING	May 29, 2019 at 4:00 pm	Meeting adjourned at 5:20 pm.	