



Student Assessment Sub-Committee Minutes

Wednesday, February 24, 2021 4:00 pm
via WebEx

Attendees: T. Adey, H. Coombs, V. Curran, S. Dalley, S. Drodge, E. Maxwell, S. Pennell, C. Pye, B. Thiessen, M. Wahl, K. Zipperlen

Regrets (in alphabetical order): M. Najafizada, P. Pike, S. Reid, C. Skanes, E. Winter

Topic	Details	Action items and person responsible
Introduction and Welcome	V. Curran welcomed the group, and introductions were made.	Call to order at 4:05 pm
Agenda review - Review for COI - Confirmation of Agenda	No COI declared. Agenda confirmed	
Review and approval of January 27, 2021 minutes	It was MOVED by B. Thiessen and SECONDED by E. Maxwell to approve the minutes of the January 27, 2021 minutes as presented. MOTION CARRIED.	
1. Business arising: - Action items from January 27, 2021 meeting	1.1 ACTION ITEMS 2.3.4 K. Zipperlen will look into data showing comparison of NBME scores with other Canadian medical schools 3.1 T. Adey to ask the Task Force if reverting to previous in-person exams practice is an option once learners return. 3.3 Recommendations from curricular review to be tabled.	2.3.4 ACTION: Ongoing with an update next meeting. 3.1 ACTION: T. Adey said Task Force is in support of returning to in-person exams, but density restrictions have to be followed according to Public Health restrictions. 3.3 ACTION: Reviewed below
2. Standing Items	2.1 PHASE 1-4 ASSESSMENT UPDATES <u>Phase 1:</u> P. Pike was not present to report. <u>Phase 2:</u> B. Thiessen said they are well into Phase 2 and there are more questions now which can't be put on the exam as they were used in the open book format. They are asking faculty for new questions. K. Zipperlen said they should get them by the end of this week. <u>Phase 3:</u> S. Drodge updated they just finished block 6 exam. The high number of deferrals, especially last minute requests, has brought up issues regarding the deferral cut-off date as it is difficult to maintain exam integrity with that many referrals. V. Curran said it was discussed at UGMS last week, and T. Adey indicated the exam deferral policy	ACTION: T. Adey, LWS, Phase Leads and Policy Analyst to meet to discuss Exam Deferral Policy.

Student Assessment Sub-Committee Minutes

Wednesday, February 24, 2021 4:00 pm
via WebEx

	<p>will be reviewed by LWS, Phase Leads, and the Policy Analyst.</p> <p><u>Phase 4:</u> S. Reid was not present to report, but will forward an email update. K. Zipperlen said the EPA Assessment Working Group is meeting tomorrow to review wording of clinic card scale and questionnaire for CDCs to see how they are implementing EPA framework. V. Curran said the e-clinic card research study asked if it was more effective to have the learner or the preceptor lead the feedback and requested EPA Assessment Working Group to look at current process.</p> <p>2.2 STUDENT MATTERS</p> <p><u>Phase 1-3:</u> E. Maxwell brought forward the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - learners want to be kept informed regarding the deferral policy review - if Proctorio is renewed, learners would like to be included in the conversation - concern that restrictions around online exams continue to increase, and the software is not really working for them. S. Pennell said they are working on the whiteboard issue, and asked to be advised of other issues and he will bring them to the company. E. Maxwell will talk to learners again to determine further issues. - learners are feeling stressed when they are flagged multiple times by invigilation software, and they would like to have footage reviewed before email is sent to them. Some clarification is needed, and E. Maxwell will speak with learners again. S. Drodge said Phase 3 learners could reach out to her or phase assessment working group if there are concerns. <p><u>Phase 4:</u> C. Skanes was not present to report, and E. Maxwell brought forward the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - learners are wondering if there is a formal timeline for summative ITARs, and K. Zipperlen said it is 6 weeks but she is not sure if that is being maintained during COVID-19. Learners should reach out to the discipline APA and follow up with the Phase 4 APA. T. Adey said it is a known concern and has been exacerbated this year. - some preceptors are telling learners they do not have the T-Res app. S. Pennell said he is surprised to hear this and it is concerning. Preceptors can easily reach out to HSIMS for 	<p>ACTION: EPA Assessment Working Group to discuss current e-clinic card process and provide update.</p> <p>ACTION: E. Maxwell to ask learners for specific concerns regarding Proctorio and forward to S. Pennell.</p> <p>ACTION: E. Maxwell to clarify learner concerns re email notifications sent after exam invigilation.</p> <p>ACTION: S. Dalley will ask about use of clinic card app and any resident concerns at next PARNL meeting.</p>
--	--	--



Student Assessment Sub-Committee Minutes

Wednesday, February 24, 2021 4:00 pm
via WebEx

	<p>support. H. Coombs said more faculty development is needed and they are working on this. S. Dalley will bring up use of T-res at next PARNL meeting. T. Adey suggested this should be a part of a mandatory orientation for preceptors. V. Curran said another orientation is coming up next month, teaching about e-clinic cards could be included. V. Curran requesting EPA assessment working group to provide recommendation regarding preceptor issues with T-res.</p> <p>2.3 ASSESSMENT MONITORING AND EVALUATION</p> <p>2.3.1 Exam blueprints Phases 2 and 3 K. Zipperlen reported on the following: -Phase 2 Class of 2024 Theme 1. The required number questions were received. -Phase 3 Class of 2023 Theme 5 – one session without questions and was not assessed. She has updated the assessment plan regarding instructional time.</p>	<p>ACTION: EPA assessment working group to discuss preceptor issues with T-res and provide update.</p>
<p>3. New Business</p>	<p>3.1 Recommendations from curricular review When the new curriculum was initiated it was decided it would be reviewed in 4 years in 2017, V. Curran presented the recommendations from this review:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feasibility of faculty submitting formative questions and providing explanation of answer: S. Drodge said some faculty are already doing this. M. Wahl said he would run it by his group at their next meeting and report back. S. Pennell indicated request for explanation could be built into current email template for faculty. 2. Introducing more clinical decision-making questions on exams in Phase 1-3: K. Zipperlen said using this type of question requires more knowledge and work. They are used by MCC on licensing exam and learners want more experience answering these questions. K. Zipperlen will check with S. Pennell and his group as scoring is different and bring back to next meeting. 3. Developing a new periodic review system across phases: T. Adey said there is no system in place now and that forward feeding of information is controversial and may warrant more discussion. May need to involve Promotions Committee. S. Pennell said there is a project on main campus that is similar and will reach out and update at next meeting. K. Zipperlen said the assessment plan says 	<p>ACTION: M. Wahl will ask faculty members in BMS/Anatomy about providing explanation for formative questions and will bring back to committee.</p> <p>ACTION: K. Zipperlen will ask S. Pennell and his group about the use of more clinical decision-making questions on exams in Phases 1-3 and bring back to next meeting.</p> <p>ACTION: S. Pennell will report back to the committee regarding the main campus periodic review system project.</p>

Student Assessment Sub-Committee Minutes

Wednesday, February 24, 2021 4:00 pm
via WebEx

	<p>learners have to meet with Phase Leads if less than 70 mark on two or more exams, but she isn't sure how that's being implemented. Struggling learners should be identified early on, maybe should be added to the discussion.</p> <p>4. Development of more faculty development tools by Phase 4 to support clinical preceptors (previously discussed)</p> <p>5. Revising examples in learner handbook re achieving entrustability and milestones: K. Zipperlen said they are working through this and will ask S. Reid to discuss at next Phase 4 meeting. S. Pennell said entrustable milestones already exist on the website and are broken down by discipline.</p> <p>3.2 Accreditation update</p> <p>K. Zipperlen and V. Curran met with B. Kerr and T. Hearn who are gathering documentation for the 2022 full accreditation visit. SAS is responsible for monitoring accreditation elements to ensure compliance with standards 9.4 Narrative Assessment and 9.8 Timely Summative Assessment. In the 2018 interim accreditation review, the standard 9.6 Setting Standards of Achievement was found to be unsatisfactory and adequate opportunities for formative assessment was flagged as well. K. Zipperlen will work on conducting onboarding for new SAS members and asked for feedback from the committee.</p>	<p>ACTION: K. Zipperlen to ask S. Reid to discuss revising entrustability examples and addition of milestones at next Phase 4 meeting.</p> <p>ACTION: K. Zipperlen to look at onboarding for new SAS members to ensure compliance with accreditation standards.</p>
Next Meeting	March 24, 2021	5:25 pm adjourned