



# Student Evaluation Committee (SEC) Minutes

---

## Student Evaluation Committee (SEC)

### APPROVED

Monday, November 28<sup>th</sup>, 2022

2:00-4:00 PM

Meeting via Zoom

**Attendees:** Drs. S. Anderson, G. Bendiak, J. Desy (chair), A. Harvey, J. Haws, K. Hecker, K. McLaughlin, B. Meatherall (for Dr. K. Busche), D. Miller, M. Mintz, C. Naugler, M. Powell, S. Weeks, L. Willetts, Mr. M. Bondok, Ms. S. Facchini, Ms. K. Fu, Mr. J. Kreutz, Ms. S. Leskosky, Ms. E. Lindquist, Ms. K. Martin, Ms. K. O'Donnell, Mr. M. Paget, Ms. E. Patching (for Dr. C. Hutchison), Mr. H. Shah, Ms. S. Shah

**Regrets:** Drs. H. Amin, K. Busche, E. Cheng, M. Davis, Z. Goodarzi, C. Hutchison, M. Keir, S. Mohan (leave), W. Rosen, Mr. S. Bell, Ms. Karen Chadbolt, Ms. L. Felske, Mr. M. Sobczak, Ms. S. Tai, Mr. J. Vak

**Guest:** Dr. Hanan Bassyouni

---

### 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 introduced Dr. Maria Powell - SEC's new Resident Representative and informed members that she will be attending meetings as a voting member going forward. Dr. Desy asked that all SEC members introduce themselves, including their role on the committee.

### 1. Approval of Meeting Agenda (November 28, 2022) and Minutes (September 12, 2022)

**Motion:** Dr. J. Hawes      **Seconded:** Dr. S. Leskosky

**All in Favor - Motion Approved**

### 2. Standing Items

#### 2.1 Committee Updates

**Pre-Clerkship:** Dr. S. Weeks informed members that the Class of 2024 is currently finishing up Course VI as well as coming close to the end of year two. This class will begin Clerkship in the New Year (after the Integrative and Introduction to Clinical Practice courses). The Class of 2025 are finishing up Course II and will be moving into their first Career Development week shortly.

**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.

**UMEC:** Dr. Naugler informed SEC members that the only update from UMEC was an item previously discussed at the SEC in terms of a potential pending change in Clerkship. Dr. Naugler commented that a matrix was previously

discussed by SEC members outlining what circumstances would prompt, or would not prompt, a student to appear before SARC (with regard to examinations). Dr. Naugler reported that this was brought forward to UMEC and approved without revision. Dr. Desy confirmed that what was passed at the UMEC are the recommendations that our committee, and the Clerkship Committee, had made surrounding failures in Clerkship. The summary statement of the Clerkship Failure Policy states that if a Clerkship student has two MCQ failures, that the student does not go directly to SARC. That student would only go to SARC after a third MCQ failure, or a failure of the same MCQ exam.

## 2.2 Reports

### Student Reports:

**Class of 2023:** Ms. Erica Lindquist informed members that her class (Echidnas) is in the middle of getting CaRMS information sorted out. Her class is excited about nearing the end of Clerkship. Dr. Desy informed members that Dr. Busche will be updating the students soon, if he hasn't done so already, about the revised Clerkship Failure Policy recently approved by UMEC. As well, this policy will be updated and uploaded online.

**Class of 2024:** Ms. Fu informed members that the Class of 2024 (Bilbies) have one Pre-Clerkship exam remaining, followed by an OSCE then followed by a winter break. Ms. Fu reported that her class was very receptive and thankful for the changes that were made to the Clerkship Failure Policy. Ms. Fu commented that over the past month, there have been a couple of questions regarding how the minimum pass levels are calculated with regards to deferral and rewrite exams. Dr. Desy offered to email Ms. Fu summarizing how the mean pass levels are calculated with regards to deferral exams. As a summary, Dr. Desy explained that exam performance is taken from the last two years (the year in question and the previous year). Depending on the relative difficulty of each of the final exams [exam A and exam B] an adjustment is made if the exam is harder, or easier, than the exam that the rest of the class wrote. It's then calculated for groups, or individuals. Because there are several combinations of exams that students write, there is usually one major passing threshold set for the deferrals (Hofstee passing threshold), then adjusted for any relative difference between the difficulty of Exam A versus Exam B. Where it gets slightly more complicated is in the setting of a rewrite exam. If a student rewrites an exam, not only do they write a different version than their peers, but that exam then becomes worth one hundred percent of their grade. Therefore, two adjustments are made for whether the version of the final exam that they wrote was harder, or easier, than the rest of the class. The second adjustment that is made adjusts for whether the midpoint exams, as a whole, were harder, or easier than the final exam. In all circumstances, they are trying to adjust exams based on the addition or removal of components to make sure that all of the students are assessed at the same level.

**Class of 2025:** Mr. J. Kreutz reported that the class of 2025 recently completed the Course II mid-point exam, an AEBM quiz and will have an Anatomy exam tomorrow with the final being the week after. The class would like to thank Ms. K. Martin, Dr. Desy, as well as the entire evaluations team for arranging the Course II Midterm Review session. Mr. Kreutz reported that he and Mr. J. Vak (VP of Academics for the Class of 2025) recently attended the Canadian Federation of Medical School's Academic Roundtable which they found it to be very informative. Mr. Kreutz commented that the class is very appreciative of having the information on MPLs from the past years. He inquired whether, or not, past averages from previous years could be provided as well. Dr. Desy commented that giving the average of an exam from a previous year might be misleading because it's not automatically going to be the same exam that the students in the incoming year will be writing. The other concern that Dr. Desy has is if the average of the previous year is quite low, does that mean that the students will be targeting that average which may not be an effective strategy. Dr. Desy offered to meet with Mr. Kreutz separately to talk about this in more detail so that she could get a better understanding of what the class is looking for and what information they would benefit from.

Mr. H. Shah (Exam Rep for the Class of 2025) reported that he was approached by his class regarding students providing exam feedback on the last page of an exam. Students found this to be very stressful and would rather use that time to review their exam answers. Mr. Shah inquired whether it would be possible to have the feedback form available during the exam review instead since they would have the exam and answer key on-hand and there would

be less time pressure. Dr. Desy asked Mr. Shah if the class was hoping for the feedback to be incorporated into decisions around questions to be dropped in that iteration of the exam, or are the students hoping to provide feedback for the purposes of improving the exams for next year? Dr. Desy commented that the timelines are a bit tight around when decisions are made around questions being dropped and its hard to ensure that by the time the exam review takes place that there will be cases where the exam review will be after the grades were already finalized. Dr. Harvey commented that there is a mechanism for a reappraisal or appeal process if there is an exam question that should have been dropped and was not, and it caused a student to fail. Dr. Desy commented that she is open to receiving feedback on the questions in any format, however; preferably sooner rather than later if the student wants it to be incorporated into decisions about that year's passing threshold.

Mr. Shah also inquired, on behalf of his class, how it is decided what questions are dropped from an exam and how that affects grading. As well, Mr. Shah inquired whether is it possible for students to know how many questions were dropped so they would know whether, or not, if there were specific changes based on the students' feedback. Dr. Desy said that she was open to informing the class of how many exam questions were dropped. At the midpoint exam review, the evaluation team will usually tell the students which questions were dropped. Dr. Desy offered to inform the class of the total number of questions dropped and how many of those questions were based on negativity, discrimination versus how many were based on student feedback. It's important for the student body to realize that when requests are given based on feedback they are taken seriously. Dr. Desy discussed the criteria regarding dropping exam questions. She offered sending Mr. Shah the policy and stated that it's very clear and specific when a question would be dropped. Dr. Desy noted that the criteria for exam questions to be dropped are all negatively discriminating questions, or any question that is based on student feedback that is found to have no correct answer, any questions based on student feedback that is found to have one or more equally correct answer, or if there was no objective of the exam content in the course. Mr. Kreutz suggested that an exam review be held for the final exam. Dr. Desy noted that correct exam answers are not released for final exams, therefore there is no post exam review. Ms. Martin commented that trying to fit the review sessions in before marks being calculated will delay marks being calculated. Dr. Desy added that a positive thing about the exam review process that we currently have, is it is a blinded review. It's possible that a strong message from the students will be that they will want the questions removed that they didn't get right. Which is not the intention of removing questions. Dr. Desy commented that the whole process of having an opportunity to remove questions is really to identify blatantly obvious questions that somehow were missed in the review process that have already taken place. Dr. Desy informed members that they look at statistical outliers on every single question on every single exam and then go back and re-review questions to see if any questions were mis-keyed or a blatant error that wasn't picked up. The majority, if not all, of the mis-keyed questions using this process is picked up. The whole idea of asking for student feedback is to identify very small minority of questions where there might have been something slipped from our grasp. Dr. Desy suggested that a student can write a feedback question on their booklet, and if you run out of time there is a full survey that is sent out and open for a number of days - that gives ample opportunity for provide feedback. Mr. H. Shah will relay this information back to his class and see if there's any specific opinions or comments they have. Dr. Desy informed Mr. Shah and Kreutz that if they have questions, or want to talk about the exam questions, they should contact the Course Chairs and Course Evaluator of the specific course directly.

**Academic Technologies** – Mr. M. Paget reported that his team is working hard preparing some new structural components inside Dolphin such as expanding around option, length and stem length. Another piece of work that the Academic Technologies team is working on is potentially having two EPA structures running concurrently in Clerkship. As well the team has been working hard on Cards and has done a great deal of work on TBLs for Course 2 and etymology cards along with the leadership in Anatomy and Course II. As well, the team is working closely with the exam team preparing more cards for creation for the expectancy to RIME.

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

### 3. Old Business/Updates:

**Interim Competency Committee** – Dr. Desy updated SEC members to let them know that they had the first Interim Competency Committee meeting a couple of weeks ago for the class of 2023. All of the assessment data was reviewed for all of the Clerkship level students. Dr. Desy reported that it was decided that for students who are not on track to complete their EPA's prior to the end of the year would be contacted by Dr. K. Busch, Assistant Dean of Clerkship, via email to let them know that they are not on track based on our analysis of previous year's students and offer supports to them to see if there's anything we can do to help.

**MCC Prep Products** – Dr. Desy informed members that we pre-purchased all of the MCC products last year for this year, therefore we will not be ordering the Prep Product Light until the year after.

**Exam Review Space** – Dr. Desy informed members that there is a lot of concerns from students surrounding the location that they have to review unsatisfactory exams. We do not yet have an answer for the students, but it is something that we are continuing to discuss. There are weekly evaluation meetings and issues regarding feedback from students are discussed. Dr. Desy reassured the committee that there is not yet a solution, but it is definitely something that the Evaluation Team is working on.

### 4. New Business:

#### **New must complete component for Medical Skills course – Dr. Hanan Bassyouni**

Dr. Bassyouni informed members that she would like to discuss the policy for attendance for the Communications portion of Med Skills. Dr. Bassyouni explained that if a student misses too many Communications sessions that the student probably did not develop the skills that they need to succeed in their interviewing of patients. Therefore, Dr. Bassyouni would like to propose that students attend 80% of the sessions per phase in order to pass the course. Dr. Desy commented that this would be a "must complete" component of this course. Dr. Bassyouni commented that with regard to a remediation strategy for students who are unable to attend (excused absences), she and Dr. Murray Lee would hold make-up sessions (two-to-three hour sessions with an SP and cases similar in difficulty) in order for students to meet the criteria. Dr. Bassyouni added that if a student misses more than a percentage of the sessions, then the attended remediation would count as a pass on the first attempt (as long as the student's absences were excused). Dr. Weeks commented that if 80% of attendance is required there will be a significant number of students who will require extra sessions, pointing out that this could be costly (faculty time, SP's, etc). As well, it should be considered whether, or not, students should be allowed to use flex days to miss Communication sessions. Dr. Weeks commented that although 80% attendance would be ideal, 60% may be more realistic as well reviewing the restriction of flex days. Dr. Harvey pointed out that this is not a revision to the attendance policy, but a decision within a course.

#### **Motion: Moved: Dr. J. Haws, Seconded: Dr. D. Miller**

It is proposed that specific to the Med Skills Communications Course students must have attended 60% of the sessions by the end of the unit taking into account excused absences or they then must have a remediation session based on the number of hours/sessions that they missed and the remediation must be complete before the OSCE.

**Carried**

#### **Change in EPA Language (Dr. B. Meatherall for Dr. K. Busche)**

Dr. Meatherall is proposing not to change the content itself of the EPA, but to change the anchor scale wording at the end of the EPA to determine if that EPA has been achieved. The proposed rewording is in keeping with the U of A's EPA anchor wording to see if the EPA is achieved (is the trainee at a point where you would be comfortable saying that tomorrow they could start their first day of Residency, and if so, the EPA has been achieved). Dr. Desy suggested that the purpose of this is not to meaningfully change the process of using EPA's or the format on how we are doing

things but it's to align our assessment tools with some of the other centers that are now implementing EPA's in our province. Dr. Harvey suggested that the revised EPA state "ready for reactive supervision as a first day Resident" (is approaching/ is not approaching).

**Motion: Moved: Dr. B. Meatherall, Seconded: Mr. Mike Paget**

It was proposed to use the same anchor wording as the U of A EPA form revising the wording to "ready for reactive supervision as a first day Resident" ○ is approaching ○ is not approaching. With a little notation defining what is a reactive resident.

**Carried**

**Reappraisal Terms of Reference (Dr. G. Bendiak)**

Dr. Desy explained that the Reappraisal TOR is fairly similar to the Clerkship Failure Policy. Dr. Bendiak informed members that she became Reappraisal Sub-Committee Chair in April, 2022. It was felt that there were parts of the policy that were a little challenging; therefore, wanted to revise the policy with a view towards making it easier for people to understand and what the various ways are to seek a reappraisal. Dr. Bendiak reviewed the Reappraisal TOR via screen share with the committee.

**Motion: Moved: Dr. G. Bendiak, Seconded: Dr. S. Anderson**

Accept the revisions made to the Reappraisal Terms of Reference.

**Carried**

The last Agenda items has been tabled to the next SEC meeting (Scheduling the release summative course grades – Drs. Janeve Desy & Adrian Harvey)

The SEC meeting was adjourned at 4:07 p.m.

**5. Next SEC Meeting – January 16, 2023 @ 2:00 to 4:00 p.m.**