



Student Evaluation Committee (SEC) Minutes

Student Evaluation Committee (SEC)

APPROVED

Tuesday, April 14, 2020

1:45 – 3:45 PM

Meeting via Zoom

Attendees: Drs. Harish Amin, Glenda Bendiak, Kevin Busche, Janeve Desy (Chair), Adrian Harvey, Jolene Haws, Kent Hecker, Carol Hutchison, Heather Jamniczky, Kevin McLaughlin, Wayne Rosen, Sarah Weeks, Ms. Kathryn Brockman, Ms. Fiona Burns, Ms. Karen Chadbolt, Ms. Samin Dolatabadi, Ms. Sue-Ann Facchini, Ms. Suzanne George, Ms. Tabitha Hawes, Mr. William Kennedy, Ms. Shannon Leskosky, Mr. Arjun Maini, Ms. Kerri Martin, Mr. Mike Paget, Ms. Laura Palmer, Mr. Matthew Sobczak, Ms. Sibyl Tai,

Regrets: Drs. Melinda Davis, Deirdre Jenkins, Suneina Mohan, Chris Naugler, Jacques Rizkallah, Mike Walsh, Wayne Woloschuk

Call to Order

The meeting was conducted through Zoom and was called to order at 1:45 p.m. by Dr. J. Desy (Chair). Dr. Desy informed members to vote on motions, with exception of Agenda/Minute approval, using the “chat” function on Zoom.

1. Approval of Meeting Agenda (updated)

MOTION: Moved by Mr. Mike Paget. Seconded by Dr. Glenda Bendiak

That the SEC Committee approve the updated Agenda for the April 14th, 2020 meeting.

CARRIED

2. Approval of Minutes from January 22, 2020 Meeting

MOTION: Moved by Mr. Mike Paget. Seconded by Dr. Adrian Harvey

That the SEC Committee approved the minutes as noted above for January 22, 2020.

CARRIED

3. Standing Items

3.1 Other Committees:

UMEC – No report to date.

PCC – Dr. Weeks explained that Course 2, MSK, is composed of three different specialty areas (orthopedics, rheumatology and dermatology). Based on timing there has been a restructure within the course - orthopedics will be taught at the end of the course with rheumatology and dermatology taught at the

beginning. With regard to the Course 2 assessments it is proposed that orthopedics will continue to have three TBL's as their formative component. Both dermatology and rheumatology will each have an online formative exam. There will be two summative exams (the first will be at the end of the rheum/derm portion and will be worth 35%). The end of the course exam will be worth 65% of the grade and will be heavily based on ortho (approximately two-thirds), the remaining one-third will be divided up.

MOTION: Moved by Dr. Sarah Weeks. Seconded by Mr. Arjun Maini

Student Evaluation Committee accept the Course 2 change to their summative assessment plan to have three different formative components and two summative components that are broken down by the three units according to time spent in the course and exam blueprint.

CARRIED

CLERKSHIP – Dr. Busche reported that the Emergency Medicine clerkship has requested to change the format of their formative evaluation with the use of cards. This will be a different way of providing a formative exam for the Class of 2021 that is a mandatory component of their Clerkship.

MOTION: Moved by Dr. Kevin Busche. Seconded by Mr. Mike Paget

Be it resolved that the Emergency Medicine Formative evaluation is a Mandatory Component of Clerkship.

CARRIED

3.2 Student Reports: Class of 2020-Ms. K. Brockman reported that the class feels anxious regarding how they did on their most recent exams. Mr. W. Kennedy reported that the class is getting ready for graduation. Class of 2021- Ms. T. Hawes reported that the class is presently “in limbo”. She said that the class was hoping to complete one clerkship exam before starting back to their clinical rotations in June or July. Dr. Busche explained that although this would be ideal for saving time later in clerkship, it would be dangerous for students to write exams before they complete their clinical work (putting students at academic risk). Dr. Desy also commented that we are trying to avoid online exams. Class of 2022 – Ms. S. George reported that the class recently received their Course 3 marks and that the class is currently in Course 4.

3.3 Academic Technologies: Mr. M. Paget reported that he, Dr. J. Desy, Mr. H. Lu and Ms. K. Martin developed a solution for all students to write fair and secure exams. He explained that they generated multiple versions of the same exam by changing the sequence of the questions so students can no longer within eye sight see another student's exam with the same set of questions. Mr. Paget informed the committee that this new system was recently used for the Course 3 exam (March, 2020). Ms. Martin reported that this new system was not too cumbersome for the exam team to manage and that the exam process for Course 3 went fairly smooth. Dr. Desy thanked Mr. Paget, Mr. Lu and Ms. Martin for their hard work.

3.4 Exam Team: Ms. Martin reported that there was nothing new from the Evaluation team. Dr. Desy thanked Ms. Martin and Mr. Sobczak for putting in extra time and hours for a huge amount of work for moving the Clerkship exams to online and ensuring that the process went well for students.

4. Old Business/Updates:

SEC TOR – Dr. Desy reported that the SEC TOR (approved by SEC in January, 2020) was also approved by UMEC.

Update on Electronic Votes: Dr. Desy reported that there were three time-sensitive electronic motions sent out to SEC members since the last January, 2020 SEC meeting. The electronic motions were as follows: 1. Setting the

Upper and Lower Boundaries of Acceptable Performance for the Clerkship OSCE (motion passed); 2. Moving the Summative Exams Online When the Clerkship and pre clerkship Rotations Were Delayed or Cancelled (motion passed); and 3. Change for the Grade Breakdown for Course 4 (motion passed).

5. Reports – Not applicable.

6. New Business

Evaluation Strategy for the New Anatomy Course (Dr. H. Jamniczky): Dr. Jamniczky gave an informative presentation detailing the new anatomy course including its evaluation structure. Dr. Jamniczky explained that all anatomy teaching will take place in the two anatomy courses (Med 300 and Med 400). Dr. Jamniczky reviewed the two attached power point presentations entitled “MDCN300 Anatomy 1 and MDCN 400 Anatomy 2 Evaluation Structure” and “MDCN 300/400 Evaluation Structure” (attached). Dr. Desy commented that it is a very well thought out course and the addition of cards is going to be very beneficial for students.

MOTION: Moved by Mr. Mike Paget. Seconded by Dr. Glenda Bendiak

Asking the SEC committee to accept the structure of the evaluation for MDCN300 Anatomy 1 and MDCN400 Anatomy 2 Evaluation Structure.

CARRIED

Policy for Setting Upper and Lower Borders of the Hofstee Compromise MPL Setting Method: Dr. Kevin McLaughlin referred to the attached power point presentation (SEC April 14 – slides 6 to 14). He explained that in the past it was a struggle to decide the best way to set a minimum performance level (MPL). After a lot of research and modelling it was decided to use the Hofstee compromise approach, setting the upper and lower boundaries of the historical MPL and the borderline student median (median performance of students from 2013-2015 who passed our curriculum but went on to fail the MCC exam). Since this time, despite changes in our course content and assessment, the variation in mean performance across pre-clerkship courses has been minimal (<5% for all). As such, we should continue to use the upper and lower boundaries that we are currently using for each course.

MOTION: Moved by Dr. Kevin McLaughlin. Seconded by Mr. Mike Paget

Assuming that the coefficient of variation for a Course or Clerkship exam is < 5%, we can use the Hofstee margins derived from the 2013 and 2014 derivation cohort.

CARRIED

Policy for establishing a Criterion Reference MPL for a New Exam: Dr. McLaughlin referred to the attached power point presentation (SEC April 14 – slides 15 to 17) explaining what would be done in a situation where there is a new exam, or new course without the historical data indicating the criterion reference to MPL and the borderline student median. He explained that it is hard to know where to set the boundaries for the Hofstee method. Dr. McLaughlin explained that they wanted to look at whether, or not, they could find a mathematical relationship linking a criterion reference MPL that they create to that upper border which in the historical cohort was the borderline student median. If they could find a relationship, they could then predict the upper border of our Hofstee from the lower border which is the MPL that we make using criterion reference standards (which in our curriculum we are currently using the Nedelsky technique to do this). Dr. McLaughlin showed a mathematical relationship between the lower and upper boundary and explained how we can arrive at the upper boundary after we set a criterion referenced MPL.

MOTION: Moved by Dr. Adrian Harvey. Seconded by Mr. Mike Paget

For new pre clerkship courses we can estimate the upper Hofstee border using this formula:
Upper Hofstee margin = $0.95 * \text{Criterion Reference MPL} + 11.46$
The criterion reference MPL is the lower boundary of the Hofstee and will be MPL that the course chair and the evaluation coordinator set using the Nedelsky technique.

CARRIED

Policy to Back-Calculate Pass Mark for Individual Assessment Elements: Dr. Desy explained that because we often have students who defer a final exam, or rewrite a final exam, and we have multiple versions of exams some students end up with a final course mark that is composed of different elements than their peers. For example, she explained that a student from the class of 2021 might write the same final exam as the class of 2022, which makes it challenging to set an overall course MPL for that student. Because the Hofstee MPL is set for the course as a whole it puts us in the position of wanting to compare assessments from two different years and potentially adjust the MPL a bit if one of the exams from one year is easier, or harder, than the other year. Therefore, it would be very beneficial to be able to calculate an MPL for an individual exam when students have a combination of exams that do not match their peers. As well, Dr. Desy explained that this may also occur when a student is unsatisfactory on a course. When the student writes the rewrite exam, their entire course mark is actually composed of only the final exam and the final peripatetic exam. Dr. Desy explained that you cannot place the MPL that is set for an entire course on just two assessments from that course, therefore we need a way to back set an MPL for an individual course component when we set the overall course MPL using the Hofstee method. Therefore, it would be optimal to back calculate the pass mark for one individual exam starting from the place where we have an MPL set by the Hofstee.

MOTION: Moved by Dr. Jolene Haws. Seconded by Dr. Adrian Harvey

Assuming a statistically significant [fixed effect] association between the score for individual elements and overall score, we can then back calculate pass mark for one individual assessment from an entire course.

CARRIED

Overview and Terms of Reference of the Competency Committee – Dr. Desy gave a recap of why the Competency Committee was created. She explained the for the class of 2020, their classes were stopped four weeks before their clerkship actually ended because of the Covid19 Pandemic. Therefore, usual methods of promoting students to graduation based on having completed clerkship rotations (including ITERS and multiple choice exams) from the Clerkship rotations no longer existed. Therefore, we needed to find a way to try to decide which of our students had met the competencies of our program and are able to proceed to graduation. The Competency Committee is intended to make these decisions. Dr. Desy explained that the Competency Committee is a sub-committee of UMEC (once the Competency Committee TOR is passed at SEC, it will be forwarded to UMEC electronically for approval). There will be two Competency Committee meetings (Apr 29th and May 6th, 2020), once those meetings are complete the Competency Committee will be dissolved. Dr. Desy reported that Mr. Mike Paget, and his team, will prepare student reports (from Clerkship). These reports will comment on how the students have performed in all of the 12 EPA's across their clerkship rotations and will be extracting this data from the students' ITERS as well as collecting data from the Clerkship OSCE and multiple choice exams. Student names will not be used, students will be identified by a number. Dr. Desy explained that the final outcome will be recommendations to the Associate Dean (he will have the final say). If it is decided that a student is not ready to graduate, that student will then be recommended to appear before SARC for recommendations on what they will need to do to graduate.

Dr. Desy reviewed the membership of the Competency Committee with SEC members. It was decided that the role of "Clinical Member" as well as "Public Member" should be replaced because of a conflict of interest. The role of "Clinical Member" and "Public Member" will be revised to reflect "TBA" on the Terms of Reference.

MOTION: Moved by Mr. Mike Paget. Seconded by Ms. Shannon Leskosky

That the SEC Committee accept the Terms of Reference of the Competency Committee based on the idea that the Membership of "Clinical Member" and "Public Member" be revised to "TBA"

CARRIED

7. Next Meeting – TBA (June, 2020). Items to be sent to members electronically:

- Reappraisal Committee (once reviewed by lawyers)
- Policy for Deferral MPLs
- Evaluation Coordinators/Clerkship Director presence inside examination halls

Meeting was adjourned @ 3:45 p.m. by Dr. Desy (Chair).

Minutes by: Jane McNeill

Minutes Edited by: Dr. J. Desy