

<b>Student Assessment Sub-Committee</b>		<b>DATE</b>	December 14, 2016
		<b>ROOM</b>	M1M109
<b>CHAIR</b>	Dr. Vernon Curran, Chair		
<b>MEMBERS:</b>  <b>2015 - 2016</b>	<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>		
<b>PARTICIPANTS</b>	V. Curran, D. McKay, M. Hogan, C. Mah, G. Vidyasankar, M. Lugowski (call-in), D. Deacon, , M. Turpin, G. McGrath, A. Pendergast		
<b>RECORDING SECRETARY</b>	<i>(Minutes Taped) Transcribed by Carol Vokey</i>		
<b>INVITED GUEST</b>			
<b>REGRETS</b>	S. Murphy, B. Thiessen, J. McCarthy, C. Moore, P. Pike, S. Pennell, M. Quann		
<b>MINUTES</b>			
<b>AGENDA</b>	<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
WELCOME	The Chair convened the meeting at 4:05p.m.	Committee members introduced themselves for the benefit of M. Lugowski (new PARNL Resident) who called-in for the meeting.	
#1 REVIEW & APPROVAL OF MINUTES	a) Approval of November 30, 2016 minutes.  b) Follow-up on ACTION	The minutes of the November 30, 2016 minutes were reviewed. There was a mistake in the Room name as it should be M1M109.  It was <b>MOVED</b> by M. Hogan and <b>SECONDED</b> by M. Turpin to approve the minutes of the November 30, 2016 minutes with a minor edit. All were in favour and the <b>MOTION CARRIED.</b> i. <u>Phase 3 Assessment of Tutorials</u> : V. Curran said the issue of content	<b>ACTION: It was moved by M. Hogan and seconded by M. Turpin to approve the minutes of the November 30, 2016 minutes with a minor edit. Motion carried. C. Vokey to make correction.</b>

	<p>items from November 30, 2016 meeting.</p>	<p>differences in material covered in tutorials versus material covered in lectures has been discussed in the past as a result of student feedback. S. Shorlin said phase leads, faculty and staff have met to talk about creating tutorial guides to be given to tutors to ensure consistency in material. As a result, they have created a guide for creating a tutor guide that involves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- making tutors aware of objectives, where the students are in the curriculum and where they fit in</li> <li>- guidance on how to run sessions</li> <li>- extent of detail to be given to students</li> <li>- expected answers around controversial areas</li> <li>- facilitating small groups</li> </ul> <p>They have applied this information to real life tutorials with J. Hickey to test its effectiveness. Some members of the group felt it should not be required to provide answer keys as it can lessen student involvement, engagement and discussion. At this point, the students have not been asked for their input, however, S. Shorlin said he is open to any suggestions. There will be a workshop for faculty on February 2 on small group tutorials with S. Shorlin and J. Hickey to go through tutor guide. M. Turpin said this sounds good, and there are some points in the student proposal being drafted for UGMS that could be included into the guide. One issue is that use of the guide is not mandatory, and he will work with S. Shorlin.</p> <p>ii. <u>Summative Assessment Procedure for Phase 4 Courses</u>: V. Curran said this is the third iteration for this document that has been revised according to UGMS suggestions. D. McKay and G. McGrath listed some items requiring editing.</p> <p>It was <b>MOVED</b> by V. Curran and <b>SECONDED</b> by G. Vidyasankar to approve the Summative Assessment Procedure for Phase 4 Courses with edits. All were in favour and the <b>MOTION CARRIED</b>.</p> <p>Edited version will be sent to UGMS for review.</p> <p>iii. <u>Phase 4 MED 8710 Assessment Report</u>: D. Deacon presented the report and highlighted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Students assessed as progressing as expected in all rotations.</li> <li>- Some students with concerns have been discussed by the Phase 4</li> </ul>	<p><b>ACTION: M. Turpin and S. Shorlin to work together on developing a tutor guide.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: It was moved by V. Curran and seconded by G. Vidyasankar to approve the Summative Assessment Procedure for Phase 4 Courses with edits. Motion carried. D. Deacon to send edited version to UGMS for review.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: D. Deacon to send Phase 4 MED 8710 Assessment Report to J. McCarthy for his response.</b></p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>team and no remediation was deemed necessary by clerkship.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mean scores for NBME's range from 64.5 in Surgery to 85.1 in Rural Family Medicine.</li> <li>- A quick report on formative assessment and feedback methods shows the formative ITAR was the main tool along with clinic cards and EPAs, prescribed clinical experiences through TRes, and other formative assessment methods particular to disciplines.</li> <li>- There is a summary of student assessment feedback evaluation forms for each rotation in MED 8710 rather than one evaluation of the course as a whole. Table shows consistently low rating of EPAs contributing to learning, and clinical exams were low rated except in Rural Family Medicine.</li> <li>- D. Deacon to send to J. McCarthy for his response.</li> </ul> <p>iv. <u>Phase 1 Community Engagement I Examination</u>: A. Pendergast explained students didn't perform as well as anticipated and this first-time exam is worth 70% of their mark. They held a QI session on Friday, and students asked to have formative questions earlier (maybe during lecture) as well as a review session, but A. Pendergast expressed concern about preserving exam question integrity. Once credits were applied, one student did not pass. C. Mah said the problem may be due to formative questions being released late as well as the fact that it was a new exam. There was much discussion around other possible causes and strategies to resolve issues going forward. V. Curran suggested a MESC workshop around faculty development and exam question writing for Community Health may help as this discipline is not accustomed to developing multiple choice questions. M. Turpin also suggested reviewing the number of questions per lecture hour.</p>	
<p>#2 PHASE 1 – 4 ASSESSMENT UPDATES (Assessment Working Group Leads</p>		<p><u>Phase 1</u>: A. Pendergast said Phase 1 had their last block exam which required one student to reassess. The Community Engagement assignments are all in except one and everyone has passed. Generally good results.</p> <p><u>Phase 2</u>: M. Hogan said the phase is in "pre-season" mode right now.</p> <p><u>Phase 3</u>: G. Vidyasankar said they have had 2 block exams, first one was ok and second one required 7 or 8 reassessments after credits and Hofstee was applied.</p>	

		<u>Phase 4:</u> D. McKay expressed concern regarding impending weather and exams that are scheduled.	
#3 STUDENT MATTERS		<p>M. Turpin questioned what happens with challenge cards once they have been submitted. Last year actions resulting from this process were more open and clear, and students feel it would be helpful to be informed if credits will be applied to an exam due to the submission of challenge cards. D. Deacon could send out an email as to which questions were credited and ask if this could be built into the process. M. Hogan expressed concern that this might encourage frivolous challenge card usage. A. Pendergast said the emails were sent out last year and she will bring an example to the next meeting.</p> <p>M. Turpin said Phase 3 Class has 2 Community Engagement exams beginning in March, and students are anxious about them as no one seems to know much about them. C. Mah said that is because the Community Engagement curriculum has been so reorganized. D. Deacon said historically there has been no issue with these exams. M. Turpin will contact the instructors involved for more information.</p>	<p><b>ACTION: A. Pendergast to bring example of email sent to students last year outlining questions that have been credited due to challenge cards.</b></p> <p><b>ACTION: M. Turpin to contact Community Engagement instructors in an effort to get more information on upcoming Community Engagement exams.</b></p>
#4 Formative/ Summative Assessment	a) Phase 4 MED 8750 Practice Continuum Assessment Plan	a) D. Deacon said key issue was bringing the assessment plan up to date as course unfolds into 2018. She outlined changes to be made and will submit this to Phase 4 and A. Williamson of UGME for inclusion into Clerkship agenda. Then it will go to UGMS for review.	<b>ACTION: D. Deacon to make proposed changes and submit final version to Phase 4 and A. Williamson for addition to Clerkship agenda before it goes to UGMS for review.</b>
#5 Update on EPA Project		D. Deacon said there was no update at this time.	
#6 Business Arising		There was no business arising and the meeting adjourned at 6:00 pm.	