

## Student Assessment Sub-Committee Minutes

Wednesday, September 25, 2019

4:00 pm

OPED Meeting Room 5

Attendees: V. Curran, N. Duggan, M. Najafizada, S. Pennell, P. Pike, C. Skanes, B. Turner (call in)

Invited Guest: N. Fairbridge (OPED)

Regrets (in alphabetical order): T. Adey, D. Deacon, S. Drodge, S. Murphy, N. Rockwood, B. Thiessen

Topic	Details	Action items and person responsible
Introduction and Welcome	V. Curran welcomed the group, and members introduced themselves.	
Agenda review - Review for COI - Confirmation of Agenda	No COI declared. Agenda reviewed and approved.	
Review and approval of prior minutes	It was <b>MOVED</b> by N. Duggan and <b>SECONDED</b> by V. Curran to approve the June 26, 2019 minutes as presented. All were in favour, and the <b>MOTION CARRIED</b> .	
Review of action items from previous meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PESC is looking at changes to MED 8710 evaluation forms.</li> <li>- T. Adey said the ad will go out this week for Phase 4 Assessment Lead, and there is a possible lead for APC Chair.</li> <li>- D. Deacon to follow up with S. Pennell re Student Success Collaborative.</li> <li>- N. Duggan to send out suggestions to learners to prepare for the mid-July summative progress test.</li> <li>- L. MacMillan and M. Nuaaman to poll students regarding block exams vs. progress testing and share feedback with Committee.</li> <li>- Review of Progress Test Pilot</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- G. McGrath and L. MacMillan - ongoing</li> <li>- T. Adey for follow up</li> <li>- S. Pennell said they are waiting on meeting with Main Campus.</li> <li>- D. Deacon to follow up with N. Duggan.</li> <li>- Survey results to be presented later in meeting. V. Curran to share information with UGMS.</li> <li>- B. Turner to present report later.</li> </ul>



## Student Assessment Sub-Committee Minutes

Wednesday, September 25, 2019  
4:00 pm  
OPED Meeting Room 5

	<p>- D. Deacon to obtain more details on assignment and rubrics before sending the Assessment Plan for MED 5740 out for email vote.</p>	<p>- V. Curran to follow up with D. Deacon.</p>
<p>1. Phase 1-4 assessment updates</p>	<p><u>Phase 1</u> - P. Pike going through exam questions, then looking at exam and comment cards. No issues to report.</p> <p><u>Phase 2</u> – B. Thiessen was not present to report.</p> <p><u>Phase 3</u> – S. Drodge was not present but V. Curran read report she submitted as follows: they “have been meeting weekly now since the 16<sup>th</sup> of August and despite the turnover in staff there are no concerns at the moment. Fatima Hammond has been helping since Jennifer Kirby started Maternity leave. As Fatima is also managing the Phase 1 workload she is currently training someone else from HSIMS for the short term (Adam Siscoe) who will help until the hiring process for Instructional Designer is completed. For Phase 3, we have had one summative exam to date and instructors have been prompt to reply to exam review emails allowing us not to have to delay distributing grades.”</p> <p><u>Phase 4</u> – N. Duggan had no concerns from an assessment point of view as just starting on next iteration of Phase 4 and nothing specific to bring up. She likes the idea of timeline for assessment plans. Working on getting that ready and in by April. Still no assessment lead or APC lead.</p>	
<p>2. Student Matters</p>	<p><u>Phase 1-3:</u> C. Skanes was not present to report, but did join the meeting just before it ended.</p> <p><u>Phase 4:</u> B. Turner on the progress testing feedback: - Class of 2020 for June exam reported better health and well-being, liked exams more spaced out over time, better ability to identify areas of weakness, overall positive comments.</p>	

## Student Assessment Sub-Committee Minutes

Wednesday, September 25, 2019  
4:00 pm  
OPED Meeting Room 5

	<p>- Class of 2021 only 44% response rate, mostly neutral or in favour of progress testing.</p> <p>N. Duggan said their hope was students learning to study more globally, and results show an improvement across the board. Resources were provided for borderline students and their results improved significantly. Phase 4 team will decide if they want to keep progress testing, and she will put numbers together for further consideration.</p>	
<p>3. Formative/summative assessment monitoring/ evaluation</p>	<p><u>3.3.1 Review of assessment monitoring schedule for 2019-2020</u> – V. Curran presented and explained schedule and that it should help to get things done in a timely manner. They will be comparing summative assessment marks in the past year vs previous cohorts. They will also look at MCC Part I scores, and at November meeting, the CGQ will be looked at. They will do an annual review of first 5 indicators over the next few months.</p> <p><u>3.3.2 Review of timeline for submission of assessment plans for 2019-2020</u> - timeline in place to avoid rushing things through at the last minute for UGMS approval.</p> <p><u>3.3.3 Phase 2 Class of 2022 assessment reports</u> - V. Curran explained process for these reports, and D. Deacon sends these out to Phase Leads.</p> <p><u>3.3.4 Phase 3 Class of 2021 assessment reports</u> - V. Curran explained process for these reports, and D. Deacon sends these out to Phase Leads.</p> <p>All members were in agreement re distribution of reports.</p>	
<p>4. New Business</p>	<p><u>Peer Assessment evaluation report by N. Fairbridge</u> – He presented a report completed to evaluate the peer assessment scale and highlighted the following: - Overall negative results.</p>	



## Student Assessment Sub-Committee Minutes

Wednesday, September 25, 2019  
4:00 pm  
OPED Meeting Room 5

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some students gave good feedback on the process as well as how to improve.</li> <li>- Scale is not useful but feedback is.</li> <li>- Number of comments that students do not appreciate the final write up.</li> <li>- Students say they were given no education on how to give effective feedback.</li> <li>- Most wanted face to face debrief sessions among groups where learners would have the opportunity to learn how to provide constructive feedback.</li> <li>- B. Turner said such small groups makes it's easy to identify who made comments.</li> <li>- Students liked online part of it, easy to understand, most liked the ability to compliment peers, some didn't feel prepared, 28% were not confident in their rating.</li> <li>- Recommendations: immediately correct One45 as 60% of students received incorrect reports, and K. Zipperlen is working on this. S. Pennell said maybe Qualtrix would be better for next cohort; expedite changing Phase 3 group size to ensure 6+ peer assessors; expedite removal of "dresses appropriately"; consider removal of "would you trust this person as a doctor"; alter orientation/training to encourage broader use of the scale range; scale is good way to start the assessment process, and then move to face to face for one on one feedback.</li> </ul> <p>V. Curran thanked N. Fairbridge for his report, and suggested the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- removing it from Phase 3 altogether because of small group size (less than 6), revising scale, and removing problematic areas.</li> <li>- Carry on in Phase 1 and 2 and look closer at Peer Assessment in Phase 3. If no other way to fit it into Phase 3, will take it out.</li> </ul>	
Next Meeting	4:00 PM October 23, 2019 Room 5 OPED	<b>ACTION: V. Curran will consult with D. Deacon, and look at again in a year.</b>

Approved October 23, 2019.