

Student Assessment Sub-Committee		DATE	April 26, 2017
		ROOM	PDCS Room 4
CHAIR	Dr. Vernon Curran, Chair		
MEMBERS: 2015 - 2016	<i>Voting members:</i> <i>Dr. Pam Pike, Phase 1 Assessment Lead</i> <i>Dr. Mike Hogan, Phase 2 Assessment Co-Lead</i> <i>Dr. Barton Thiessen, Phase 2 Assessment Co-Lead</i> <i>Dr. Gokul Vidyasankar, Phase 3 Assessment Lead</i> <i>Dr. Jason McCarthy, Phase 4 Lead (Clerkship Coordinator)</i> <i>Mr. Mackenzie Turpin, Phase 1-3 Student</i> <i>Mr. Matthew Quann, Phase 4 Student</i> <i>Dr. Magdalena Lugowski, PARNL Resident</i> <i>Dr. Catherine Mah, Member-at-Large</i> <i>Dr. Craig Moore, Member-at-Large</i> <i>Ex officio (non-voting) members:</i> <i>Dr. Donald W. McKay, Associate Dean, UGME</i> <i>Dr. Sean Murphy, Chair, UGMS Committee</i> <i>Ms. Gerona McGrath, PESC</i> <i>Ms. Diana Deacon, Educational Specialist, Assessment</i> <i>Mr. Stephen Pennell, Manager, Health Education Technology and Learning</i> <i>Ms. Elas Winter, Support Staff, UGME</i>		
PARTICIPANTS	V. Curran, P. Pike, M. Lugowski (call in), D. Deacon, S. Pennell, M. Turpin, G. McGrath		
RECORDING SECRETARY	<i>(Minutes Taped) Transcribed by Carol Vokey</i>		
INVITED GUEST			
REGRETS	D. McKay, S. Murphy, M. Hogan, C. Mah, G. Vidyasankar, B. Thiessen, J. McCarthy, C. Moore, M. Quann		
MINUTES			
AGENDA	ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
WELCOME	The Chair convened the meeting at 1600h.		
#1 REVIEW & APPROVAL OF MINUTES	a) Approval of March 29, 2017 minutes. b) Follow-up on ACTION	The minutes of the March 29, 2017 minutes were reviewed but not approved as quorum was not met.	ACTION: Minutes of the March 29 meeting tabled for approval at next meeting.

	<p>items from March 29, 2017 meeting.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>NBME examinations Surgery and Pediatrics</u>: as this only applies to advanced exams there is no issue. ii. <u>MED 6780 Community Engagement II assignment</u>: C. Mah not present and this item will be tabled for a future meeting. iii. <u>Mid-point evaluation in clerkship (PESC)</u>: G. McGrath said last month's Clerkship meeting didn't go ahead. CDC's will be reminded to touch base with faculty to ensure evaluations are being done. This item is on the agenda for the May clerkship meeting, and G. McGrath will report back to this committee. Keep on agenda. iv. <u>Phase 2 Professionalism essay feedback</u>: M. Turpin will get this when students return from break. Keep on agenda. v. <u>Phase 3 Research Curriculum ethics essay</u>: J. Hickey to report back after bringing this to UGMS on April 27th. 	<p>ACTION: MED 6780 Community Engagement II assignment to remain on agenda for discussion with C. Mah.</p> <p>ACTION: Mid-point evaluation in clerkship to be kept on the agenda, and G. McGrath will report back to this committee.</p> <p>ACTION: Phase 2 Professionalism essay feedback item to be kept on agenda to give M. Turpin the opportunity to collect information from students.</p> <p>ACTION: J. Hickey to report back regarding Phase 3 Research Curriculum ethics essay.</p>
<p>#2 PHASE 1 – 4 ASSESSMENT UPDATES (Assessment Working Group Leads</p>	<p>a) Phase 3 MED 7740 Phase 4 Preparation Assessment Plan</p>	<p><u>Phase 1</u>: P. Pike said Medical Expert Healthy Person being revised, and the assessment plan will be presented at next meeting.</p> <p><u>Phase 2</u>: M. Hogan was not present to report.</p> <p><u>Phase 3</u>: G. Vidyasankar was not present to report.</p> <p>a) <u>Phase 3 MED 7740 Phase 4 Preparation Assessment Plan</u>: Recommended for presentation to UGMS for approval. D. Deacon said they were minor changes. S. Pennell checked QuestionMark for clarification on pass mark for online module and determined that modules are completed until a mark of 100% is reached (as per Eastern Health requirement). D. Deacon will send the assessment plan to UGMS for discussion at tomorrow's meeting.</p> <p><u>Phase 4</u>: J. McCarthy not present to report.</p>	<p>ACTION: D. Deacon will send the MED 7740 Phase 4 Preparation assessment plan to UGMS for discussion at next meeting.</p>

#3 STUDENT MATTERS		M. Turpin said there are no new issues as students have been away. There are still some scheduling issues related to the short block.	
#4 Formative/ Summative Assessment Monitoring/ Evaluation (D. Deacon)	a) Phase 2 and 3 Exam Blueprints	a) D. Deacon reviewed the Phase 2 and 3 Exam Blueprints. M. Turpin pointed out duplication of the Diagnostic Procedures II lecture in Block 8 Phase 3. V. Curran determined that objectives are different for each session. M. Turpin said the Environmental Health objectives do not really match the exam. Also, the questions were unusual, specific and confusing. V. Curran and D. Deacon to pull Community Engagement III assessment plan and meet with Phase 3 Lead to discuss Environmental Health assessment and teaching.	ACTION: V. Curran and D. Deacon to meet with Phase 3 Lead to discuss Environmental Health assessment and teaching.
#5 Update on EPA Project		S. Pennell said they have received survey results on the app and feedback shows that it forces students to have what they feel is an awkward conversation with preceptors. Paper cards are still available and are considered easier as there is less interaction between students and preceptors. Moving forward, D. McKay, J. McCarthy and T. Laughlin will have to review and offer suggestions. S. Pennell will present results at next meeting.	ACTION: D. McKay, J. McCarthy and T. Laughlin will review and offer suggestions on how to proceed with the app. ACTION: S. Pennell to present results of survey at next meeting.
#6 Peer Assessment (V. Curran)		<p>V. Curran said he and D. Deacon worked on the peer assessment survey with feedback from M. Turpin and M. Quann and it has gone out to Phase 4 students for both years. As of yesterday 26 students have already responded. D. Deacon will send another reminder message next week. M. Turpin commented that the Class of 2017 are thinking of the MCC exams now. For the other 2 years, M. Turpin suggested paper version of the survey in an attempt to get better response rates and schedule into ILS sessions that do not have QI sessions after them (May 11 and 19). Students will have 15 minutes to complete and will hand back. S. Pennell suggested it may be better to use the lab as computers are available. D. Deacon to follow up with him on this. V. Curran asked for an update at next meeting. D. Deacon also wrote a summary of some of the literature on peer assessment, and the plan is to review student survey results at next meeting, and then make the recommendation to UGMS on peer assessment for next year.</p> <p>V. Curran and D. Deacon also reviewed over 30 articles on peer assessment and found a rating scale that assesses mainly professional behaviours and professionalism. They are considering adopting this valid and reliable scale as the majority of studies on peer assessment in undergraduate medical education</p>	ACTION: D. Deacon to send another reminder message regarding the peer assessment survey next week. ACTION: D. Deacon to follow up with S. Pennell on using the computer lab for the peer assessment survey. ACTION: The question of where to integrate the peer assessment rating scale into curriculum will be discussed at next meeting.

		leaned towards assessing unprofessional behaviours and professionalism. The question of where to integrate into curriculum will be discussed at next meeting. M. Turpin commented the idea of “appropriate dress” makes him nervous as it is potentially problematic. S. Pennell said it does say “for the situation”.	
#7 Business Arising		No business arising.	

The meeting adjourned at 1649h, and the next meeting is scheduled to take place on May 31, 2017.