



Student Evaluation Committee (SEC) Minutes

Student Evaluation Committee (SEC)

APPROVED

Monday, June 20th, 2022

2:00-4:00 PM

Meeting via Zoom

Attendees: Drs. S. Anderson, G. Bendiak, J. Desy (chair), A. Harvey, C. Hutchison, K. McLaughlin, M. Mintz, C. Naugler, S. Weeks, Mr. M. Bondok, Ms. K. Chadbolt, Ms. S. Facchini, K. Fu, Ms. Kerri Martin, Mr. M. Paget, Ms. S. Shah

Regrets: Drs. H. Amin, K. Busche, M. Davis, Z. Goodarzi, J. Haws, K. Hecker, R. Hurowitz, D. Jenkins, M. Keir, W. Rosen, L. Willetts, Mr. S. Bell, Ms. L. Felske, Ms. S. George, Ms. S. Leskosky, Ms. E. Lindquist, Mr. M. Sobczak, Ms. S. Tai

Call to Order

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

Dr. Desy welcomed Dr. Marcy Mintz to the SEC. Dr. Mintz is the accreditation lead for the UME Program and will be a non-voting member on SEC.

Dr. Desy also informed members that there has been a slight SEC membership adjustment. Dr. Desy explained that two members, at large, have been added to SEC. Dr. Desy explained that Dr. Glenda Bendiak recently took over as our Reappraisal Chair therefore she now leads the Reappraisal Committee that takes reappraisal requests from our students. The rules of that committee are that Dr. Bendiak and two members of SEC are chosen for each reappraisal. After they review all of the reappraisal documents and reach out to anybody that needs to weigh into the reappraisal, they vote. Dr. Desy commented that there were some Faculty members that were interested, and available, to hear reappraisals therefore we have added two members, at large, to expand our pool of people to allow us to hear reappraisals in a timely manner. Dr. Desy explained that the details of this addition will be discussed further in September, 2022 when the SEC TOR is updated.

1. **Approval of Meeting Agenda** – The June 20, 2022 Agenda was approved.

Motion: Dr. K. McLaughlin **Seconded:** Mr. M. Paget

All in Favor - Motion Approved

2. **Approval of Minutes from March 7, 2022 SEC Meeting**

Motion: Dr. S. Weeks **Seconded:** Dr. G. Bendiak

All in Favor - Motion Approved

3. **Standing Items**

- 3.1 **Committee Updates**

PCC: Dr. Weeks informed members that the class of 2024 are doing their Course IV final summative exam tomorrow (June 21st) followed by a week of Introduction to Clinical Practice/Integrative, followed by a week of Career

Development, then followed by a week of summer vacation. As well, the class of 2025 begin classes (in-person) on July 4th.

Dr. Weeks also informed members that the Pre-Clerkship Committee is learning a lot about RIME and its potential.

Clerkship: Dr. Busche was unable to attend today's SEC meeting. Dr. Desy reported that there are no major updates from the Clerkship Committee. From an assessment perspective, things are running quite well with no major concerns.

UMEC: Dr. Naugler reported that UMEC has no additional updates to add.

3.2 Reports

Student Reports:

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

Class of 2024: Ms. K. Fu noted that there are no big concerns with regards to evaluations, other than the Agenda item "Passing Threshold Release to Students" which will be discussed later in the meeting.

Academic Technologies – Mr. M. Paget explained that we have had some slight site slowdowns over the last six months; however, render speed has gone up considerably in the last ten days which is good news since this has impacted a lot of our processes. Mr. Paget also explained that an OSLER update will take place the morning of June 21st (during the Course IV, class of 2024 MCQ).

Evaluation Team: Ms. K. Martin did not have any new business to report at today's meeting.

Dr. Desy reminded members that if you are involved in creating, or submitting summative exams, there are guidelines set forward around how long in advance these are required. Dr. Desy explained that making edits is not possible after the exams have been printed and sent to main campus. Dr. Weeks suggested that since PCC will not be meeting again until this September, that perhaps an email be sent to PCC course leads as well evaluation coordinators reminding them of the timing of creating, editing and submitting summative exams. Dr. Desy will remind all pre-clerkship course leads and evaluation coordinators, via email, about the rules and policies surrounding exams.

Dr. Desy also reminded SEC members that with regard to Clerkship, we had started a new process last academic year where we interactively reviewed the performance of our clerkship exams. After every sitting of an academic clerkship exam, we updated an excel spreadsheet with student performance noting failure rates in each of the clerkships over time. This process has allowed us, when needed, to make adjustments to the passing threshold that was set at the beginning of each clerkship year. Dr. Desy noted that, as a quick update, we have not had to make any changes to any of our Clerkship exams therefore the passing threshold that we set, and then adjusted last year, seems to be working quite well for this academic year.

4. Old Business/Updates

None

5. New Business:

Allowing Anatomy Preceptors in Peripatetic Examinations (Dr. Adrian Harvey)

Dr. Harvey explained that the policy regarding not allowing course and evaluation leaders into the examination setting be revisited. Dr. Harvey reminded members that in the past year SEC came to a consensus that course leaders would not be present during exams for the pre-clerkship and clerkship. Dr. Harvey explained that with regard to the Anatomy Peripatetic exam the students would not be disadvantaged by having the course or

evaluation leaders present as there are time restrictions on exam questions and having a course leader present would be advantageous. Therefore Dr. Harvey proposed that we allow the course or evaluation leads be physically present during the anatomy peripatetic exams to manage and respond to students' concerns.

Motion: Moved: Dr. A. Harvey, Seconded: Mr. M. Paget

It is proposed that with regard to the existing policy regarding the presence of a course, or evaluation, leader in the examination setting be modified to allow the course, or evaluation, leader to be present during anatomy peripatetic examinations.

Carried

ITER Comment Boxes (Dr. J. Desy for Dr. K. Busche)

Dr. Desy shared and reviewed the current Clerkship ITER and explained that a couple of minor changes were being brought forward by Dr. K. Busche. Dr. Desy explained that all of the sub-item components on the ITER are primarily there as formative feedback to the students to let them know about domains and where they may be excelling and where there's areas that they potentially could improve. The first revisions proposed is making it clear to the preceptors that the overall assessment is the only global rating that shows up on the students' MSPRs. The second revision proposed is that in the second comment box (titled "Other comments – feedback for the student and program that will NOT appear on the MSPR"), Dr. Busche would like to propose to change the language to say "explain any performance deficiencies or unsatisfactory ratings or any outstanding items from above." Mr. Paget commented that the implementation of these revisions should not happen until at least after the completion of the class of 2023 MSPR process (keep all Clerkship ITERs uniform); therefore, these revisions could potentially "rollout" in October, 2022. Dr. Desy suggested that the SEC vote on these revisions today and since there is quite a bit of time before the revisions would be implemented, further information or thoughts could be brought up in a future SEC meeting.

Motion: Moved: Mr. M. Paget, Seconded: Dr. S. Weeks

It is proposed that our drafted ITER revisions (noted above) will go back to Dr. Busche for discussion with an eye on voting again before final implementation after the MSPR cut off for the class of 2023.

Carried

Exam Review Timing for Exams Scheduled Within 20 Business Days (Ms. K. Martin)

Ms. K. Martin explained that currently the Exam Review Policy states that a student can review their exam within 20 days of receiving a result, but not two weeks before their scheduled rewrite. Generally, results and rewrites are scheduled far apart, but there is the occasion when a rewrite exam does come closer than two weeks directly following the release of results. Ms. Martin would like to propose to allow exceptions that if a student gets their exam results and they're going to have to do a rewrite in less than two weeks, they still have the opportunity to review. Dr. Desy noted that this is a very rare circumstance and usually only arises in the situation where a student may have submitted a reappraisal and has been given their rewrite date and then receive the results of the reappraisal close to the date of the rewrite.

Motion: Moved: Ms. K. Martin, Seconded: Dr. G. Bendiak

It is proposed to allow exceptions that if a student gets their exam results and they're going to do a rewrite in less than two weeks, they will have the opportunity to review their exam when it's a truncated timeline out of the individual student's control.

Carried

Passes Threshold Release to Students (Ms. K. Fu & Mr. M. Bondok)

Mr. M. Bondok gave the committee a quick overview about the students' concerns regarding the question of how the mpl is calculated and how the students' performance is predicted at the current time relative to their success in certain courses. Dr. Desy gave a brief background behind the changes that led up to the situation we are currently in with determining the mpl. Dr. Desy explained that many years ago, we used to set an mpl for every individual exam (each midpoint would have an mpl and the student would be deemed either satisfactory or unsatisfactory for each assessment). This was followed by a final assessment with an mpl. The mean was based on the percentage that each assessment was worth therefore the students had a good idea of how they were doing to date. However, we have since moved to the Hofstee Compromise method of setting the mpl (passing threshold). The actual passing threshold is set at the very end of the course once all of the components are completed. For a short period of time we did the Hofstee Compromise but also provided students the mpl's from our old curriculum. However, we realized those mpl's were not predictive of the final passing threshold for the course because they were set using different methods. Therefore, SEC voted that moving forward students were given the mean and the standard deviation of their class on a specific exam. As well, a note was added to the bottom of the exam results to notify the students that if they are two standard deviations, or below, from their class mean that it may be an opportunity to reflect on study strategies and reach out if support is needed. Dr. Desy reported that the current issue, as Mr. Bondok explained, is that sometimes the passing threshold is not two standard deviations, or below, from the class mean – sometimes it's above that, therefore what students are running into is the circumstance where they are not below two standard deviations from the mean and they are falsely feeling like they're doing okay in the course and on route to pass, but then, when they do their final summative components the passing threshold comes out and it's above two standard deviations and they are unsatisfactory on the course but did not have the early warning signal. Dr. Desy explained that she, Mr. Bondok and Ms. Fu have been having some discussions about what would be a better metric to share with the students.

Ms. Fu and Mr. Bondok presented a slide show titled "Passing Threshold Release to Students" (attached). As well, Dr. K. McLaughlin presented a slide show titled "Predicting Failure From Individual Assessment Elements" (attached). Mr. Bondok commented that the main takeaway is to make sure that students are aware that they should be thinking about how they should be approaching a course, so that no student is at a point where they fail a the course and had no idea that it was coming. A discussion ensued regarding the slide shows. Dr. Desy thanked the members for the discussion and offered to make a chart that indicates the passing thresholds of the Anatomy courses from the last two years and it could be made publicly available on OSLE. As well, Dr. Desy added that the data could be continuously updated at the beginning of each year.

6. Next SEC Meeting – September 12 @ 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. Zoom link pending.