



Student Evaluation Committee (SEC) Minutes

Student Evaluation Committee (SEC)

APPROVED

Monday, January 18th, 2021

2:00-4:00 PM

Meeting via Zoom

Attendees: Drs. H. Amin, S. Anderson, Mr. S. Bell, G. Bendiak, K. Busche, Ms. K. Chadbolt, J. Desy, Ms. S. Facchini, Ms. L. Felske, Ms. S. George, A. Harvey, J. Haws, K. Hecker, C. Hutchison, Ms. S. Leskosky, Ms. E. Lindquist, Ms. K. Martin, K. McLaughlin, C. Naugler, Mr. M. Paget, J. Rizkallah, W. Rosen, Mr. M. Sobczak, S. Weeks, M. Wash, L. Willetts, Ms. L. Oakenfold (Admin).

Regrets: Drs. M. Davis, Ms. F. Burns, Ms. S. Dolatabadi, Ms. T. Hawes, D. Jenkins, M. Jung, Mr. A. Maini, S. Mohan, Ms. L. Palmer, Ms. S. Tai

Call to Order

The meeting was conducted through Zoom and was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by Dr. J. Desy (Chair). Welcome to members and a brief overview of what the meeting would entail.

1. Approval of Meeting Agenda – Approved.

Approval of TOR – pending electronic approval of membership/titles only.

2. Approval of Minutes from November 3rd, 2020 Meeting – Approved.

3. Standing Items

3.1 Committee Updates

PCC: Dr. Weeks reported that students are currently in Course III, with Course IV following soon.

Clerkship: Dr. Busche noted no new report from an evaluation point of view.

UMEC: Dr. Naugler noted no new report to date.

3.2 Reports

Student Reports: Dr. Desy noted that she will speak to the strategies to reduce risk of cheating on online summative assessments. Currently only midpoint summative assessments are occurring online. Final multiple choice exams are still in person. It was circulated in December that discussion would proceed at this meeting, with the suggestion that students were not permitted to go back and review questions on exams.

Class of 2022: Ms. George noted that the class completed the last OSCE for preclerkship, and just completed ICP/Integrative. They are looking forward to Clerkship. The students understand better the ratings from the OSCE and that scoring a 2 out of 5 on the global rating scale is where they are supposed to be. Dr. Desy encouraged preceptors to enter comments for those students who are unsatisfactory, with specific constructive feedback. It was noted that the orientation to the upcoming OSDCE was very helpful in showing how the scale works. It has been stressed to the examiners to provide comments for as many stations as possible. Dr. Desy indicated that the functionality of not being able to move on without the comments has not begun as yet.

Class of 2023: Ms. Lindquist noted that in Course II, the students became aware that there was concern for colluding or cheating on online exams. Dr. Busche suggested to the Committee that there should be no going back to an exam question, once an answer is submitted. Ms. Lindquist indicated this has a significant impact on the students as most students leave the difficult questions to the end, therefore, this will negatively affect the students, and possibly not remedy the cheating/collusion. She also noted that students felt there was a stigma associated with students being chosen (either randomly or voluntarily) to do in house exams. She asked the committee if they could provide the data or mechanism of cheating, as they are not aware what is happening. She noted they are aware of the difficulty of UME booking enough exam rooms for the students in order to adhere to the COVID rules of distance, and they can only accommodate about 38 students. They are also aware of the technical difficulties of utilizing proctoring for online exams. It was asked why people were suspected of collusion/cheating, and how to move forward. Dr. Desy reported that they are not permitted to share any exam data and it cannot be discussed in this committee. Mr. Paget will provide more information on the difficulty in having online exams proctored with this committee.

Academic Technologies – Online Proctoring: Mr. Paget noted that with online proctoring the student typically has to provide a video of the room, as the MCC, University of Alberta, and Queens have done. He noted that if someone is seen doing something untoward, i.e. texting with others, etc., they would have to physically come in and do a re-write of the exam. Online proctoring with spyware is not well received by students, and we are uncomfortable with having access to student's computers. Dr. Desy indicated they are looking for better options. She noted UME is trying to prevent cheating/collusion when using online exams. Dr. Desy emphasized that she isn't interested in this because of something that has happened in the class, but because UME wants to make a better process for cheating prevention. Ms. Lindquist reported that students would prefer to come in to do exams in person. Dr. Harvey supported Mr. Paget's reluctance in online proctoring software, as in a case study in the American Board of Surgery, who hired an outside company to do their proctoring, and this led to massive technical failure. More concerning was that this software had been used for identity theft for credit cards, etc.

Evaluation Team: As noted in minutes from Ms. Martin.

- 4. Old Business/Updates – Removing the option to revisit questions on online exams and to bring back as many students as possible for in house/in-person exams:** Dr. McLaughlin summarized that the gold standard is to have in house in-person exams, however, UME has been forced to move away from that, due to COVID protocols. He noted that when students do online exams, it is easier to cheat, and he noted that some medical schools' reputation has been tarnished by this method. Dr. Naugler noted upon review of the data, with an independent eye, it was extremely likely that there has been collusion with online exams. Dr. McLaughlin noted that from the point of view of SEC, cheating produces bias and reduces the validity of the exams. He noted that as a medical school and university, it is far better to prevent cheating than catching students cheating. Ms. Martin noted that the exams will now be randomized so that every student gets a different version of the exam. Having different start and end times, would be more difficult. However, it was recommended not to have a huge gap between start times, to alleviate any collusion with students finishing and texting each other. It was also noted that if the start time of exams were changed, it would be more challenging for the students who have accommodations.

Dr. Desy noted that as of recently, they have been working to scramble the order of questions and this is the plan moving forward. Dr. Desy noted if students can't return to questions, there is a possibility that the class mean could be lower but that the Hofstee compromise MPL setting method would ensure that the passing threshold would be adjusted accordingly. Dr. Weeks did confirm that historically for the anatomy exams, it was never possible to return to questions.

Dr. Weeks noted this technique of not returning to questions, has been utilized in other education centres, as well as the Royal College exams, and professional business exams.

Dr. McLaughlin recommended randomization of order of exam questions, with a plan to implement this. Dr. Weeks emphasized that UME is in no way trying to implement something that will hurt anyone, UME wants to help everyone and doing randomization alone won't help. Dr. McLaughlin noted that when students do come in house, in-person to do a written exam, they also do not have the option to go back to the question either.

Proposal: Dr. Weeks proposed that SEC invoke a process by which online exams are randomized or scrambled, with a "no go back to questions" policy in the interest of exam validity and security. 13 voted Yes, 3 voted no, none abstained.	PASSED
---	---------------

Dr. McLaughlin explained that there is only enough physical space to bring back 38 students in 'in class' exam writing due to the COVID protocols of distancing students in theatres. Discussion ensued on students' various suggestions on how to enable an equitable way of how students could be chosen to write these in house exams. Dr. McLaughlin noted that some students have issues with their internet, some have to have accommodations, and other pertinent confidential reasons that students request to come in to write exams. Mr. Bell noted that students wondered if the students who are colluding or cheating have been called in to write the exams and there is a stigma associated with this. Dr. Desy indicated that being invited to write an exam in person is NOT an allegation of student misconduct. Dr. McLaughlin suggested that this could be alleviated by ensuring that each student be invited to at least one in house, in-person exam. If there are concerns about misconduct, this is addressed through the academic misconduct policy that is followed by UME. Dr. Desy emphasized that UME is trying to prevent students from cheating/colluding, not trying to choose people and make their peers suspicious of them. The object is to have the assessment process be valid. UME's objective is for students to succeed, and this is being done for the student's benefit, as well as the university. Dr. Desy noted that UME does not want to add any more stress to students for exams.

5. **Pre-Clerkship: Action: Dr. Weeks will send to SEC the new ITER for Pre-Clerkship career exploration program for electronic approval.** Dr. Weeks noted this came about as there was a shift for pre-clerkship electives, as many students had put their choices all in one basket. She noted that now there is career exploration to have the students meet with various specialists or people in different disciplines and there should be a way to evaluate this time, therefore, the new ITER. This hasn't been finalized in One45 to date, but once it is completed, this ITER can be approved electronically by SEC. The students would complete one EPA and any concerns of unprofessionalism would be noted as well.

Clerkship: No new report.

Other:

Update to Re-Appraisal TOR: Dr. Desy noted a minor update to the Re-Appraisal of Clerkship Mid Point ITERS policy. This policy goes over how a student files a reappraisal and how the outcomes of the assessments are handled. Dr. Desy explained how a reappraisal of ITERS is completed, which is unique. The midpoint clerkship ITER can be reappraised. Generally speaking, before completing the reappraisal of a midpoint ITER, UME waits for all components of the clerkship to be completed. This doesn't change fact that the same deadline applies for submission of a reappraisal (within 10 business days of receiving the grade). This policy change was pre-circulated to members. **Action: Dr. Weeks will ensure that this information goes out to all students.**

Proposal: The updated Reappraisal of Clerkship Mid Point ITERS process policy, as previously distributed was recommended.	Approved unanimously.
--	------------------------------

Updated Competency Committee TOR: As per pre-distributed TOR, Dr. Desy noted this was under UMEC, however, she wanted SEC to review this, as this Committee determines whether someone graduates or not. This committee reviews the data from the whole curriculum. The Committee only receives non-identifiable information, with only

assessment results. If the committee feels that there is not sufficient information to vote, they may ask for more information, that is not identifiable, and the Committee reconvenes a second time, and then votes. The Committee must have a complete consensus to agree on the vote. If this is not possible, this is then sent to the Associate Dean and he presents these students at SARC. **Action: Dr. Desy requested input about these TOR, as these are very important decisions. Ms. Oakenfold will send these out to members with this request.**

SEC – Setting passing threshold for Rewrite Exams: Dr. Desy reminded members about the last SEC discussion, where it was voted on a strategy on adjusting the Hofstee borders in setting a passing threshold for courses where a component is removed. This will be the same strategy for deferral/rewrite exams, with one difference: for rewrite exams, the final grade on that course is calculated using only the final exams (all of the mid-point exams are removed from the grades). If students are unsatisfactory on the course and rewrite a final assessment, when we create their grade, we drop the quizzes and we only calculate on final exams.

<p>Dr. Desy proposed the same mathematical technique be used to calculate the passing threshold for deferrals/rewrites as was passed for setting the hofstee borders when removing components from a course</p> <p>One abstained, and remaining approved.</p>	<p>PASSED</p>
---	----------------------

SEC TOR: As previously distributed, Dr. Desy noted that only the membership had changed, and asked members to verify the spelling and titles of their names to Ms. Oakenfold. **Ms. Oakenfold will circulate these again, with this request to be electronically responded to.**

- 6. **Next SEC Meeting – Monday, March 1st 2021 @ 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. Zoom link pending.**
Further meeting on Tuesday, May 18th, 2021 @ 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. Zoom link pending.

Minutes by: Lily Oakenfold
Edited by: Dr. J. Desy