

Student Assessment Sub-Committee			DATE	February 22, 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, D. McKay, C. Mah, G. Vidyasankar, P. Pike, D. Deacon, S. Pennell, M. Turpin, G. McGrath			
RECORDING SECRETARY	<i>(Minutes Taped) Transcribed by Carol Vokey</i>			
INVITED GUEST				
REGRETS	S. Murphy, M. Hogan, B. Thiessen, J. McCarthy, C. Moore, M. Lugowski, M. Quann			
MINUTES				
AGENDA	ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION	
WELCOME	The Chair convened the meeting at 1607h.			
#1 REVIEW & APPROVAL OF MINUTES	a) Approval of January 25, 2017 minutes. b) Follow-up on ACTION items from January 25, 2017 meeting.	The minutes of the January 25, 2017 minutes were reviewed. Last ACTION item should include Phase 2 as well. It was MOVED by C. Mah and SECONDED by G. Vidyasankar to approve the minutes of the January 25, 2017 meeting with suggested edit. All were in favour and the MOTION CARRIED. i. <u>Phase 4 MED 8710 Assessment Report Response</u> : D. Deacon talked to J.	ACTION: It was moved by C. Mah and seconded by G. Vidyasankar to approve the minutes of the January 25, 2017 meeting. Motion carried.	

		<p>McCarthy last week and he asked her to email it to him again. She has emailed it again, but has no response yet.</p> <p>ii. <u>Phase 4 Independent Projects Rubrics</u>: D. Deacon said they are working on this and that it is almost complete.</p>	
#2 PHASE 1 – 4 ASSESSMENT UPDATES (Assessment Working Group Leads)	a) MED 6780 Community Engagement Essay Rubric (C. Mah)	<p><u>Phase 1</u>: P. Pike said there were no updates to report.</p> <p><u>Phase 2</u>: M. Hogan not present to report.</p> <p><u>Phase 3</u>: G. Vidyasankar said not much more to add since last meeting. Things are going smoothly. They are missing a lot of the exam questions for Block 6 Cardiac sessions, but person responsible is well aware.</p> <p><u>Phase 4</u>: J. McCarthy not present to report. D. Deacon noted nothing new to report.</p> <p>a) Defer to March meeting.</p>	ACTION: MED 6780 Community Engagement Essay Rubric item to be deferred to March SAS meeting.
#3 STUDENT MATTERS		<p>M. Turpin raised the following student concerns:</p> <p>1. As a follow up regarding rescheduling reassessments, he said there is a discrepancy in that the first year Phase 2 class was told they would need 100% of people reassessing to agree in order to move a reassessment, which is different from what others were told. G. McGrath said the issue of reassessment cycles came up at PESC yesterday. G. Vidyasankar asked what protocol is followed for reassessment, and E. Winter said a student would have to fill out a request for a deferral to write a reassessment. She also said L. Kenny offered the option of deferring the next exam because the reassessment was so close to it. M. Turpin said every reassessment in Phase 2 and 3 is within 5 days of a block exam, and said this is going to be an ongoing problem. S. Pennell said it could be a logistic issue that inhibits a quick turnaround, and E. Winter said it takes a long time to get the assessment groups together to make up the reassessment exam. V. Curran will bring this issue to the next UGMS Committee meeting for discussion.</p> <p>2. Concern regarding how EKG in Cardiology will be assessed in Phase 3 as the exam won't be like the modules. Students have already been encouraged to challenge EKG items that are problematic. Students are struggling with the modules and feel they will not do well on these exams and would like to have better communication on this issue. G. Vidyasankar said they will keep this in</p>	ACTION: V. Curran to bring reassessment scheduling issue to next UGMS Committee meeting for discussion with Phase Leads.

		mind as they prepare the exam, and G. McGrath said the UCL for Cardiology is also aware of the issue.	
#4 Formative/ Summative Assessment Monitoring/ Evaluation (D. Deacon)	a) Phase 2 and 3 Exam Blueprints	<p>a) D. Deacon reviewed the Phase 2 and 3 Exam Blueprints and highlighted the following:</p> <p><u>Phase 2 Block 1</u> received 77 questions and expected 90 no topics with no questions</p> <p>There was a discussion regarding how students attempt to determine which questions would be on exams from lectures/labs/tutorials, and the Committee suggested that students should be less committed to trying to determine the questions and more to studying all the material as all exams have blueprints to ensure that all material is covered.</p> <p>V. Curran said there have been emails and a meeting regarding the volume of assessment in Phases 1 to 3, and mentioned a study in UK medical schools that shows students who have a higher frequency of assessment tend to do better in national board exams. V. Curran will distribute report and is continuing to search for similar North American studies. This issue of volume of assessment and related anxiety was discussed. D. McKay suggested we may not be identifying the problem properly and that we may need to change how the curriculum is delivered. He also suggested data previously gathered on reassessment be studied. G. McGrath will check into information that may have been gathered around stress levels based on assessments.</p> <p><u>Phase 3 Block 4</u> no topics with fewer questions than required Liver PBL had 0 questions and has never been assessed and noted for follow-up</p> <p><u>Phase 3 Block 5</u> 2 topics with no questions 1 topic with fewer questions than required</p>	<p>ACTION: V. Curran to distribute report on UK assessment volume to the Committee and continue to look for similar North American studies.</p> <p>ACTION: G. McGrath to check to see if there has been any data collected regarding stress levels due to assessments.</p>
#5 Update on EPA Project		S. Pennell said the app launched on Monday, 5 activities have been recorded, all preceptors have received accounts, there are 38 participants, and a site has been set up for reference. There will be feedback recorded during the pilot and a	ACTION: S. Pennell to get end date of pilot project for V. Curran.

		<p>survey at the end. V. Curran said they have applied for a summer student and that person could construct the survey. M. Turpin said he will also be receiving feedback from students on how the app is working, and S. Pennell asked him to forward it to elearning@mun.ca so his team could access it.</p>	<p>ACTION: M. Turpin to send any app feedback he receives from students to elearning@mun.ca.</p>
#6 Business Arising		<p>D. Deacon said the issue of where and how Peer Assessment is done came up at PESC yesterday, and whether or not ILS is the best place to do it. The Committee discussed the issue, and G. McGrath said A. Goodridge will be sending a formal request to SAS to look at this.</p> <p>D. McKay said he received the accreditation report this afternoon, and we are compliant with all 12 standards, and we are compliant in 7 of 8 elements that were the subject of a recent status report. He then offered his congratulations to the group and said the report will be discussed further at the next Faculty Council meeting.</p>	

The meeting adjourned at 1712h, and the next meeting is scheduled to take place on March 29, 2017.