



Student Evaluation Committee (SEC) Minutes

Student Evaluation Committee (SEC)

APPROVED

Monday, February 6th, 2022

2:00-4:00 PM

Meeting via Zoom

Attendees: Drs. S. Anderson, J. Desy (chair), A. Harvey, J. Haws, K. Hecker, M. Keir, B. Meatherall (for Dr. K. Busche), M. Mintz, S. Weeks, L. Willetts, Ms. S. Facchini, Ms. K. Martin, Ms. K. O'Donnell, Mr. M. Paget, Mr. M. Sobczak, Ms. S. Tai, Mr. J. Vak

Regrets: Drs. H. Amin, G. Bendiak, K. Busche, E. Cheng, Z. Goodarzi, C. Hutchison, K. McLaughlin, D. Miller, S. Mohan (leave), C. Naugler, M. Powell, W. Rosen, Mr. S. Bell, Mr. M. Bondok, Ms. L. Felske, Ms. K. Fu, Mr. J. Kreutz, Ms. S. Leskosky, Ms. E. Lindquist, Mr. H. Shah, Ms. S. Shah

Call to Order

The meeting was conducted via Zoom and was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by Dr. J. Desy.

Approval of Meeting Agenda (February 6th, 2023) and Minutes (November 28th, 2022). A minor adjustment to the Agenda – “Minutes to be approved are from November 28th not September 12th, 2022”.

1.

Motion: Mr. M. Paget **Seconded:** Dr. S. Weeks

All in Favor - Motion Approved

2. **Standing Items**

2.1 **Committee Updates**

Pre-Clerkship: Dr. Weeks reported that PCC meetings are taking place in parallel with the RIME Implementation Committee meetings. Course Leaders are still giving feedback and there are still year 2 courses for the class of 2025 coming up. The class of 2024 is in Clerkship. There are a few students who still have outstanding items pending, but otherwise the class of 2024 started their first mandatory block this morning. The class of 2025 is currently in Course III, AEBM, Anatomy with the Med Skills OSCE coming up in March. Following the week of their OSCE, the class of 2025 will take part in the second of three Career Development weeks. Of note, there are two clerkship classes currently in the clinical space therefore capacity to place the students from the Class of 2025 is limited. Dr. Weeks requested that if anyone is aware of any spaces where they could take one of our “Spinies” (Class of 2025) into their environment, it would be very much appreciated. Dr. Weeks mentioned that the areas that Ms. Facchini is struggling to place students is surgical specialties, oncology and dermatology specialties. Dr. Weeks also noted that the Career Development week is followed by a week off for students. Therefore, the students have been given the option that they could flip their Career Development week into their vacation week and have their vacation week the first week. Following the Career Development week, the class of 2025 will then be enrolled in year 2.

Dr. Desy noted that it is a milestone that the class of 2024 has moved into their first mandatory Clerkship rotation. The evaluation team, as well as Ms. Facchini put in a great deal of time and effort to carefully plan all of the assessments (deferrals, rewrite exams and various components of the program) that needed to take place before students began Clerkship this year. Great job!

Clerkship: Dr. Bonnie Meatherall joined our meeting filling in for Dr. Kevin Busche as he was unable to attend today's SEC meeting. Nothing specific was passed along to Dr. Meatherall from Dr. Busche to bring up at today's SEC meeting. Dr. Meatherall noted that, as Dr. Weeks mentioned, today was the first day of Clerkship's official mandatory rotations for the class of 2024.

UMEC: Dr. Naugler was unable to attend today's meeting. Dr. Desy noted that there is a UMEC meeting scheduled for this Friday therefore she will update the SEC after that meeting takes place.

2.2 Reports

Student Reports:

Class of 2023: The student representatives from the Class of 2023 were unable to attend today's meeting.

Class of 2024: The student representatives from the Class of 2024 were unable to attend today's meeting.

Class of 2025: Mr. J. Vak explained that he and Mr. J. Kreutz (VP of Academics for the Class of 2025) spoke with many VP of Academics from other medical schools across Canada and wanted to give a huge "shout out" and "thank you" to Dr. Desy, Ms. Martin and the entire evaluation team stating that our medical school has the best exam review policy. Mr. Vak explained that our medical school trains the students to better reflect from what they have learned, as well, noted that our students are able to do an exam review in a timely manner. Dr. Desy thanked Mr. Vak and also recognized Ms. Martin and the exam team at doing a fantastic job!

Mr. Vak reported that the students from the Class of 2025 have a lot of exams coming up so they are busy preparing for that (Course 3, AEBM and year one OSCE).

Academic Technologies – Mr. Paget explained that his team has been working for some time on some additions to the psychometrics for exams where they include character count both in the questions' stem and options. This will be launched with the RIME curriculum, and will fold over the psychometrics coming from other courses as well for the summative exams. As well, the other item that the team has launched, are the new EPA forms (mostly Electives) in One45 - that this Committee put forward.

Evaluation Team – Ms. K. Martin reported that there was nothing new to report at today's meeting.

3. Old Business/Updates:

Exam Review Space – Dr. Desy reported that there have been several conversations both at the SEC and via email, as well as meetings with our students about the process that we were previously using for student exam review. Dr. Desy reminded members that if a student was unsatisfactory on an exam they were able to come to the UME and review their exam and learn from it, and also to potentially identify items for reappraisal. We were receiving quite a bit of feedback from the students stating that it didn't feel like the UME was a private location. There were concerns amongst the student body about the location as well. Therefore, after having several discussions around this topic, the SAW (Student Advising and Wellness) offered to host our exam reviews going forward. This new process has been implemented as a pilot to see how it goes and ensure that it's feasible. As of now, if a student is coming to review an unsatisfactory exam, the scheduling of that, and also the location, are now arranged through the SAW office. The SAW office is able to arrange a private workspace within their facility and supervise the student. Dr. Desy commented

that she will continue to report back about how this new process is going. Dr. Desy thanked the SAW team for offering their space.

4. New Business:

Release of Summative Course Grades (Dr. J. Desy)

Dr. Desy reminded members that after every midpoint and final exam, we have a very specific number of steps that are followed to decide which questions will be deleted. Currently, the process is to ask for feedback from our students as well as from our Faculty and then set a passing threshold before the grades are released. Currently, the way the process works it can take a variable amount of time to get through each of those steps for the exams. Currently, the goal for releasing all of the grades is within 14 business days of the assessment. Dr. Desy explained that for midpoint exams, it is a lot easier to release the grades earlier, because although the exam team still has to complete most of the steps, the data does not have to be compiled to set a passing threshold. Therefore, Dr. Desy noted that the midpoint exams are generally released quite quickly so that the students are able to have their review session, learn from their errors and move on in the course. Dr. Desy explained that when it comes to the release of the final summative course grades, the same process is in place with the addition of setting a passing threshold. Releasing the grades of summative exams enables students to find out if they are satisfactory, or unsatisfactory on the course as a whole. Dr. Desy explained that there is a difference between a student receiving a final course grade as opposed to a midpoint grade. The way that the midpoint grades are released is that a mean and a standard deviation is given (not a passing threshold), therefore, the student can see how they are doing relative to their peers but not receive a decision on how they performed on that midpoint overall.

Dr. Desy explained that there has been a lot of feedback from the students that it's quite stressful when they are waiting on a final summative grade, not knowing when exactly it will be released (within the fourteen business days). Students claim that it can be very anxiety provoking each day to open your email and not know if you are going to receive your course grade that day, or not. The students do not know when to expect the release of the grades. Dr. Desy would like to propose to schedule the release of the summative course grades (not the midpoint grades) and to schedule them on the fourteenth business day after the student has written the final assessment in the course. Dr. Desy commented that this will hopefully achieve a lower level of anxiety for the students, because at the beginning of the year, we can tell the students exactly when they will receive all of their summative grades. This will hopefully prevent a lot of "back and forth" conversations between the students and the exam team about when the marks will be released. This process will hopefully give a level of certainty that is more comforting to the students, as well, allows the exam team to move through the appropriate steps and know that the exam team will be done and ready to release the final marks on the fourteenth business day after the assessment.

Dr. Desy asked for comments from the Committee. Dr. Weeks commented that this new process would be very beneficial for the SAW Hub to have some predictability about when they need to ensure that they are available to help support students who may be upset by their final grade mark.

Mr. J. Vak commented that some students may not feel that this proposal is favorable since on many occasions students receive their grades before a 14 business day period. Dr. Desy suggested that students may not be in favor initially, but students may realize in the long run that it's preferable and better to know in advance when the grades will be released.

Dr. M. Mintz commented that Accreditation wise, it's going to be very positive for everyone to know the actual release date rather than having the uncertainty. Dr. Mintz noted that this proposal is completely in alignment with the accreditation standards, and the process is similar to a lot of other high stake exams scores that are released (ex. LMCC, Royal College).

Motion: Moved: Dr. J. Haws, Seconded: Dr. A. Harvey

The release of final summative grades will be scheduled. They will be released on (or around) the fourteenth business day after the last assessment occurs.

Carried

Adjustment to the Dropping of Negatively Discriminating Questions Policy (Dr. J. Desy)

Dr. Desy explained that currently part of the post exam review process includes doing some statistics on all of the items on all of the examinations. To review the statistics, the evaluation team has created a heat map and this is used when the team is reviewing multiple choice questions in all of the courses. This helps to identify which questions are the statistical outliers, which questions are statistically underperforming and where we can target our quality assurance processes to improve the exam. Dr. Desy shared and reviewed a graph describing the discrimination index and difficulty of exam questions.

Dr. Desy explained that the current process is that any question that is negatively discriminating we automatically drop before we calculate the class mean, the class performance and then set our passing threshold. This has been the process because with negatively discriminating questions an assumption is that something is wrong with the way the question is worded, or the way the material has been taught. Dr. Desy commented that something that has been noticed over time, is when the evaluation team meets with course chairs and evaluation representatives to review the questions in this category, in many cases the negatively discriminating hard questions and the negatively discriminating medium questions have a fatal flaw which makes them not functional questions. However, regarding the negatively discriminating easy questions, often times a high percentage of the class got the question correct (at least 86 to 100% of the students got it correct) therefore there could be a very small number of students who got that question incorrect, and if one or a couple of those students is in the highest quartile it pushes that question into being negatively discriminating, even though there wasn't a flaw with the way the question was written. This will get corrected when the passing threshold is set (when the passing threshold is set the actual performance of students in the class is used and if a number of easy questions is dropped, everyone's mean goes down a little, and when the Hofstee Compromise is used the passing threshold goes down slightly and it corrects itself). Dr. Desy explained that statistically this works, however, when students review an unsatisfactory exam it's very hard for an individual student to accept that they failed the exam when there could have been three or four questions that were dropped that they answered correctly. Students feel that it is unfair and they should get the marks for the questions that they answered correctly, then pass the course. Dr. Desy explained that when you look at the exam statistically there really wasn't anything wrong with the dropped questions, and as well the students have put in a lot of time and effort to learn all of the course content. Dr. Desy explained that it doesn't feel right to remove a number of questions that the student got correct just because there was maybe one or two students who got them incorrect, and they were in the wrong quartile. Therefore, Dr. Desy would like to propose that we continue to drop all negatively discriminating questions that are of hard or medium difficulty, but that we do not drop the negatively discriminating questions that are of easy difficulty and this is because of the fact that those questions are not fatally flawed. It is more defensible to the student body to leave those questions in place and create a passing threshold based on keeping them in and moving from there.

Motion: Moved: Dr. B. Meatherall, Seconded: Dr. S. Anderson

Starting with the next iteration of courses, we do not automatically drop negatively discriminating questions that are easy.

Carried

The SEC meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

5. Next SEC Meeting – March 13, 2023 @ 2:00 to 4:00 p.m.

