



Student Evaluation Committee (SEC) Minutes

Student Evaluation Committee (SEC)

APPROVED

Monday, March 1st, 2021

2:00-4:00 PM

Meeting via Zoom

Attendees: Drs. H. Amin, S. Anderson, G. Bendiak, A. Harvey (Interim Chair), K. Hecker, C. Hutchison, D. Jenkins, K. McLaughlin, J. Rizkallah, M. Walsh, S. Weeks, L. Willetts, Mr. S. Bell, Ms. K. Chadbolt, Ms. S. Facchini, Ms. L. Felske, Ms. S. Leskosky, Ms. E. Lindquist, Mr. M. Paget, Ms. S. Tai

Regrets: Drs. K. Busche, M. Davis, J. Desy, J. Haws, M. Jung, S. Mohan, C. Naugler, W. Rosen, Ms. L. Ansell (Palmer), Ms. F. Burns, Ms. S. Dolatabadi, Ms. S. George, Ms. T. Hawes, Mr. A. Maini, Ms. K. Martin, Mr. M. Sobczak

Call to Order

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

1. **Approval of Meeting Agenda** – The March 1, 2021 Agenda was approved with one addendum: ICP Assessment, Dr. S. Weeks (under new business)

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

Motion Approved

2. **Approval of Minutes from January 18, 2021 Meeting**

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

Motion Approved

3. **Standing Items**

- 3.1 **Committee Updates**

PCC: Dr. Weeks reported that they are continuing to work on Course IV and examining if there will be more opportunity for students to learn in person.

Clerkship: Dr. Busche was unable to attend today's meeting, therefore there is no Clerkship report.

UMEC: Dr. Naugler was unable to attend today's meeting, therefore there is no UMEC report.

- 3.2 **Reports**

Student Reports:

Classes 2021 and 2022: Student representatives from the Classes of 2021 and 2022 were unable to attend today's meeting therefore there are no reports.

Class of 2023: Mr. S. Bell explained that the class is winding up Course III, as well as the end of year one therefore it has been an exam-heavy month. The majority of what students are presently concerned with in particular was quiz

2 (Course III). The students found the quiz to be concerning because it was a substantial “step-up” from what students had previously seen. As well, there were a few concerns regarding accessing exam accommodations. Mr. Bell will bring forward specific concerns that need clarifying regarding exam accommodations with the evaluation team and the accommodations’ office. Mr. Bell commented that the class of 2023 would like to extend their appreciation for the kindness given to students from everyone who has been running the Anatomy Course, as well as the OSCE preparation and training.

Academic Technologies – Mr. Paget reported that based on student feedback the team updated the timer mechanism in the exams and the update has gone fairly well. Mr. H. Liu has been able to roll out the scramble with exam “no navigation” and those exams have been executed. The Chromebook onsite (regarding the 38 students who write exams onsite at different intervals) has been going well. The Academic Technologies team has had ongoing conversations with One45 in order to make the EPA competencies visible to the students as well as a self-lead report - the team is working on tweaking this before it is released to the students with documentation.

Evaluation Team: Dr. Harvey reported that there were no updates the evaluation team other than what will be discussed a little later on in the old and new business.

4. Old Business/Updates

MSII OSCE Electronic Vote - Dr. Harvey commented that the Med Skills II OSCE vote that was sent electronically had passed. He reminded members that this motion was with respect to setting the vertical cut-offs for the Hofstee compromise analysis of the OSCE results. This vote was required in order to set the number of OSCE stations that need to be passed (in order to pass the exam) we set the upper and lower limits and then ran the Hofstee analysis. The evaluation team is intending to look at a more automatic and standardized method of doing that for OSCE exams of different station lengths in the future so that we will not have to revisit this process of asking for approval every time an OSCE exam has a slightly different number of stations.

Promotions and Graduation Standards Policy - Dr. Harvey reported that the Promotions and Graduation Standards Policy (previously circulated) was passed at the most recent management meeting. The purpose of this document is to formalize the position of the Competency Committee in the process of recommending graduation decisions from the Associate Dean and through to SARC.

Rotating Clerkship Exam Update - Dr. Harvey commented that in January, 2020 we had met with all of the clerkships and discussed the upcoming plan to alternate exams between rotations, therefore alternating A Forms and B Forms of exams during the year. Many of the initial rewrite exams were not in a position, at that point in time, to make that possible therefore they were given a year’s reprieve. We are now planning to roll that process out for most clerkships this coming year, however, there are a few clerkships that we will have to assess whether, or not, both of their exam forms are reasonable and whether, or not, we have enough data to alternate them as primary exam forms (not restricted to re-write) moving forward. Therefore, there may be a partial roll out for this year’s clerkship class with a plan for full roll-out for next year’s class.

5. New Business

Career Exploration Program Student Assessment Plan (Dr. S. Weeks)

Dr. Weeks reported that what used to be called the Pre-Clerkship Electives is now called the Career Exploration Program. Dr. Weeks explained that the Career Exploration Program is when the first year students get matched with a career coach. This enables the students to have opportunities to work with various disciplines (this year it is done virtually), and then this is followed up by three one-week Career Exploration weeks. Dr. Weeks explained that traditionally, the Pre-Clerkship Electives weeks were evaluated with a fairly traditional ITER which looked at the students’ ability to take history, physical exam and various other competencies. Dr. Weeks explained that with regard to the ITER, they are aiming at decoupling the assessment piece and enabling the freedom to explore a career with a safe environment for students to try out things that they may, or may not, end up going into. Mr. Paget and Dr. Davis

have revised the ITER so that the assessment is more inline with what they want that experience to look like. Dr. Weeks noted that there is a box around professionalism on the assessment form. She explained that they want the opportunity to still be able to flag students that may be having issues within that domain so that they can be helped by taking part in some coaching; therefore, hopefully the student will not get any negative flags or comments when it is a higher stakes assessment. The assessment provides an opportunity for comments from the preceptors (provide formative learning and feedback). Dr. Weeks noted that the comments would not be part of the MSPR. They are looking at having this assessment replace the previous Pre-Clerkship Elective ITER for the assessment of those three one weeks.

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

The SEC Committee adopt the Career Exploration ITER as the new assessment tool for the Career Exploration Weeks.

Carried

Career Exploration EPA 1 (Dr. S. Weeks)

We are looking for opportunities to allow students to gain experience through EPA assessments, knowing that these are formative, as well it's a preparatory process for when students go into clerkship, then residency. It was felt that the EPA 1 – which was obtaining a history and physical exam was reasonable for the early stages of training. For example, the class of 2024 will have their first Career Exploration week in December, 2021. This will be at the end of their first six months of medical school and obtaining feedback by a faculty member, or a senior resident, would be very beneficial (valuable feedback). Mr. Paget explained that there is a five-point entrustment scale that is used at the resident level and the goal with this form is to actually place Pre-Clerkship learners between stage one and stage two. The Clerkship EPAs place students between stage two and stage three and the goal of that is to communicate in two ways, one about the expectations of the learner in this environment, and also for our learners to start to understand where they sit on the scale.

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

The SEC Committee accept an EPA-based formative assessment as part of the Career Exploration Program (specifically Career Exploration weeks).

Carried

Addition of non-MSPR comment box back to Clerkship ITERS

Dr. Harvey presented this item on behalf of Dr. Busche. Dr. Harvey explained in previous years the Clerkship ITERS had two comment boxes, one box was for official comments that were to be included in the MSPR (for CaRMS) and the second box was for the preceptor to provide formative feedback (not to be included in the MSPR). Dr. Harvey explained that a number of years ago the second comment box was removed. It was removed because a number of programs had become aware of the fact that there may be some feedback in the UME that was not being made available to them, as a result of this, many programs decided to require students to upload scans or PDF copies of all of their original ITERS. Because of this, the second comment box was removed from the ITER, realizing that we were losing some formative feedback but at the same time we did not want to systematically disadvantage our students in the CaRMS process compared to other medical schools. Since then, CaRMS and the AFMC has claimed that requesting copies of ITERS is no longer permitted and have communicated this to the programs. Therefore, Dr. Harvey suggested that the time is now to re-add the second comment box to the Clerkship ITER for the purpose of formative feedback with a reassurance that it is purely formative and will not have a negative consequence on the students' MSPRs. In addition, it was discussed (with input from Mr. Mike Paget) that if this decision were to be reversed this data could be removed from the ITERS in order to protect the students.

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

The SEC Committee accept the Clerkship ITER be amended to include a comment box, this is for formative feedback to not appear on the MSPR, noting that there are safety mechanisms by which these comments are reviewed and can be edited if needed.

Carried

Examination Review Pending SARC Appearance/When Repeating Years (Dr. A. Harvey on behalf of Dr. Desy)

It has recently come to the attention of the evaluation team that there is a barrier within the policies that potentially do not allow exam review when an one would be useful to take place. The current practices and policies allow a student to review their exam only once they have a rewrite exam scheduled. However, there have been a number of cases in which a rewrite exam is not scheduled, but a reappraisal, an appeal or a SARC appearance is upcoming at which time a review of this exam material could support those processes on the side of the student. The main revision that the evaluation team wants to propose would be that the student does not need to have a rewrite currently scheduled in order to review an unsatisfactory exam and this could be done in advance of a reappraisal, an appeal or SARC appearance. The existing rules around timing and setting of review would remain the same.

Motion: Moved: Dr. K. McLaughlin, Seconded: Dr. H. Amin

SEC Committee accept the proposal that a student should be allowed to review an unsatisfactory exam prior to a rewrite, or for reappraisal, an appeal or a SARC appearance.

Carried

EDI (Equity, Diversity and Inclusion) and Exams (Dr. A. Harvey on behalf of Dr. Desy)

Dr. Harvey reported that the evaluation team, in light of some recent concerns about specific questions on exams, is planning to have a review and also ask for help for policies related to EDI-related issues with questions. The plan is to request the EDI Subcommittee of UMEC (once formed) to provide guidelines related to the inclusion of EDI topics and content on exam questions re: when things are appropriate, or not appropriate for inclusion, and do a scholarly review of our existing questions looking at the number of times identifiers of race, gender, sexual orientation, and other related identifiers are mentioned in the questions and whether, or not, they add substance to the questions. Dr. Weeks requested that anyone having an exam or a course coming up in the near future, carefully review the questions with an EDI lens. Dr. Harvey noted that this item will be tabled for discussion at the next SEC meeting.

Introduction to Clinical Practice Assessment (Dr. S. Weeks)

Dr. Weeks informed members that she was presenting the ICP assessment on behalf of the ICP team. Dr. Weeks gave a brief description of the ICP Course indicating that it is a very interactive course which makes it difficult to make an appropriate assessment. The ICP team is proposing for ICP (Part 1), that they would like to remove the mandatory attendance, as well as the reflective assignment in terms of the “must complete elements of the course” and they would like to add a formative online quiz as well as an assessment (formative) of EPA 6 which is a patient presentation. In terms of ICP (Part 2), again the removal of mandatory attendance and removal of the reflective assignment and replace it with an online formative quiz. As well, the students will also keep the logbook as well as a MED reconciliation assignment (self-marked with elements from EPA 10).

Motion: Moved: Dr. S. Weeks, Seconded: Dr. K. McLaughlin

SEC Committee accept the proposal of altered assessment criteria for ICP (Part 1 and Part 2) that eliminates the mandatory assessment and reflective assignment and incorporates a formative online quiz as well as an assessment of EPA 6 with presentation and an ICP (part 2) to the addition of an online formative quizzes and keeping both the logbook and MED reconciliation as a “must complete”.

Carried

**6. Next SEC Meeting – Monday, May 17th, 2021 @ 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. Zoom link pending.
Edited by: Dr. A. Harvey**