



Student Evaluation Committee (SEC)

APPROVED

September 28th 2018

Room G701H – UME Boardroom

Attendees: Drs. Kelly Albrecht, Harish Amin, Kevin Busche, Janeve Desy, Jolene Haws, Keven McLaughlin, Jacques Rizkallah, Pamela Veale, Wayne Woloschuk, Ms. Tabitha Hawes, Mr. Arjun Maini, Mr. William Kennedy, Ms. Sue-Ann Facchini, Ms. Shannon Leskosky, Ms. Kerri Martin, Mr. Mike Paget, Mr. Matthew Sobczak, Ms. Sibyl Tai, Ms. Danielle Goss (admin)

Regrets: Drs. Baxter, Bendiak, Chahal, Chou, Coderre, Cusano, Le, Leduc, Ms. Na'ama Avitzur, Ms. Kathryne Brockman, Ms. Sarah Smith

1. Approval of Agenda

The September 28th 2018 SEC Agenda was approved.

- **Motion: Mr. M. Paget Seconded: Mr. W. Kennedy**

2. Approval of May 18th 2018 Minutes

The May 18th 2018 SEC Minutes were approved.

- **Motion: Mr. M. Paget Seconded: Dr. M. Davis**

3. Welcome to new SEC Members

Dr. McLaughlin went around the room and had the committee introduce themselves to those present.

Reports and Standing Items

a. Report From Students

Mr. Kennedy noted that they had just received their grades for the Course V Midterm evaluation, he stated that he is starting to notice the burn out in the class of 2020 now that they are halfway through, and he says that is showing in the attendance through the course. Ms. Hawes stated that they just completed their first midterm in Course I and that there was stress build leading up to that exam from the students but have calmed down since. She and Mr. Maini both agreed and

said the opinions they've received from students are that the exam was hard but fair and went well overall.

b. UMEC

In Dr. Coderre's absence, Dr. Veale noted that the UMEC item of discussion was coming up in New Business point c: proposed clerkship changes.

c. Preclerkship

Dr. Busche informed the committee that when courses have any proposed changes to their evaluation structure it is to be brought to the SEC committee for approval. Course II is wanting to change their evaluation slightly, in the past the course has been made up of a midterm exam, two take home exams – one for rheumatology one for dermatology, a peripatetic, an OSCE and a final exam. They are hoping to get rid of the OSCE component for the course, as the course chairs feel it is not helpful to the course and confused the students. They would like the approval of the grades breakdown as follows: midterm 8%, take home exam for rheumatology 6%, take home exam for dermatology 6%, peripatetic 20%, and final exam 60%.

- **Motion: Dr. K. Busche Seconded: Dr. M. Davis**
- **Motion: Passed** (all in favor, none opposed, none abstained)

Dr. Busche moved to the next course wanting to change their evaluation structure which is Applied Evidence Based Medicine (AEBM). He noted that currently the evaluation of the electives portion of AEBM is just an ITER and that is staying the same, the other teaching based components are two midterms, an individual presentation, and a small group leader evaluation component that is evaluated by the preceptor for their work towards their own small group. They have suggested two different breakdown options for the weightings on this component, they are as follows: Option one – two quizzes each worth 25%, CAT worth 30% an evaluation of presentation within small groups worth 20%. Option two – two quizzes each worth 30%, CAT worth 30%, and small group presentation worth 10%. Dr. Davis shared her perspective on favoring the second option, higher weighting on the quizzes, based on experience of being a preceptor and marking this situation in the past. She noted that every small group is different and runs differently based on those in the group. There was more discussion based upon both options proposed, most in favor of the second option, two quizzes worth more. Dr. Busche's motion is to have the new breakdown for AEBM as follows: two quizzes worth 30% each, CAT worth 30% and the small group presentation worth 10%.

- **Motion: Dr. K. Busche Seconded: Dr. M. Davis**
- **Motion: Passed** (all in favor, none opposed, none abstained)

Discussion: Mr. Kennedy questioned how you could set the MPL for the student leadership portion of the grade, to which Dr. McLaughlin determined there would not have to be an individual MPL for this portion, as long as the entire course would still have their MPL set based upon the course chairs for AEBM's historical data. Dr. McLaughlin made it known that we were just deciding on the weighting for now, how they would combine the percentage components at a later date.

d. Clerkship

Dr. Veale notified the committee of some of the changes to the University policy on requirements of medical notes. She stated the new policy includes the fact that students are not required to get medical notes for any illness going forward. We have only required

medical documentation for exams and SARC meetings as examples in the past, upon clarification this is to remain the same, however, the students are able to either provide the note or complete a statutory of declaration, which is found on the website. In regards to accommodation requests, we will still require documentation as we always have. There is also no change in the assessment of fitness in a professional environment.

Dr. Veale's next topic she brought forward is that of the ITER's and the implications of some residency programs for CARMs which is now asking students to submit the entire ITER for their application. Our ITER's include information for the UME that aren't included when it comes to MSPR's those areas include tracking attendance, conflict of interest, and a second comment box that is not for MSPR use that is used for comments for the UME about the program or other student information. Dr. Veale expressed her disappointment as there could be plenty of ways that we will be affected. Dr. Davis suggested adding a link into the ITER, instead of the second comment box, that would direct evaluators to still be able to add this comment if choosing to do so but so it will not appear on the ITER like it currently does. There was a lengthy discussion that ensued after about trying to have a transparent ITER form used nationally so that every undergrad school would be giving the same MSPR.

e. Director of Student Evaluations

Dr. Desy wants to add more structure to the examination schedules to help prevent some chaos within the UME in regards to exams. She proposed that she would like all examinations sent to the UME by the first stay of the course, with no changes added unless items are removed such as information on the core document and the student blue print has been changed. There was a fair amount of discussion based around this with the different course schedules and concepts Dr. Busche brought up the courses that run longitudinally such as Medical Skills and Course VIII and being those are longer courses that those evaluation times could be given about two to three months before an examination takes place. Ms. Tai questioned about the policy for the clerkship exams as the rotations run year round, Dr. Desy still suggested that it was to be submitted to the UME three months before the exam is written. There was discussion around this which included options of having examination material into the UME at the start of the clerkship year. Dr. Desy motioned that all examination material be submitted to the UME based on courses as follows: Courses I – VII at the start of the course, Course VIII and Medical Skills three months before the exam date, Clerkship exam at the beginning of the clerkship year or three months before the first administration of the examination.

Dr. Desy would also like to set a time limit on changes to the distribution of marks as well, she noted that previously changes to the percentages or types of assessments always had to be approved by SEC. These changes would still need to go through SEC however with a suggested time limit of at least two months before the start of the course to ensure the core document is accurate. Dr. Busche expressed his concern with some of the timelines being tough to meet due to the frequency of SEC Meetings, asking if there options for electronic approvals if necessary to make changes in between SEC meetings for course changes. Motion changes to the distribution or format two months before the course start, changes to the individual examination have to be submitted three months before that assessment occurs, on a rolling basis with the goal of everyone making this happen fully by next year.

- **Motion: Dr. J. Desy Seconded: Dr. K. Busche**
- **Motion: Passed** (all in favor, none opposed, none abstained)

Dr. Desy's next focus was on the process of appeals, she currently informed the committee that the appeals are done through the SEC committee where the student, the student representatives, faculty, and their representatives all have the opportunity to speak at the same

time in the presence of the other. Currently, that causes for uncomfortable and uneasy situations for both faculty and students in being present for each-others statements. Dr. Desy would like to propose that going forward in order to better protect the students and faculty members would be to have the student and their representative come in independently give their statement and leave, then have the faculty members and their representative come in and give their statement and leave, then there would be a deliberation and decision based upon each statement given and that would be told to the student privately. There was discussion based upon the differences between the SEC committee membership as well as a subcommittee; the appeals subcommittee is utilized if it is an appeal for a written evaluation or an OSCE, the SEC committee is used if the appeal is for ITER's or an overall course evaluation. Dr. Veale approves but is wanting to confirm with Philip Zachariah, the University Of Calgary Cumming School Of Medicine's Legal Counsel to confirm that we in fact can do this for appeals going forward. Motion is to have students and faculty to speak at the committee separately for any appeals.

- **Motion: Dr. J. Desy Seconded: Dr. K. Busche**
- **Motion: Passed – Pending Legal Approval** (all in favor, none opposed, none abstained)

f. Accreditation Issues

Nothing to state.

g. Academic Technologies

Mr. Paget informed the committee that they've rolled out a new overall this evaluation is a fair test question which is on OSLER. This is tied to the evaluation coordinators which will be represented on their faculty performance records, and in the case of clerkship the frequency of the examinations and the scale of effect of the exams. It also gives the opportunity being at the beginning of the course rather than at the end of the course survey, after results have been received to provide a more unbiased response, as this continues through Mr. Paget told the committee they will be able to see the data form from this better.

h. Evaluation Team

Ms. Martin's first topic is on the current calculator policy, which states that students are not able to bring a calculator into any exam unless specified. Motion to allow students to bring a basic calculator to all exams.

- **Motion: Ms. K. Martin Seconded: Dr. J. Desy**
- **Motion: Passed** (all in favor, none opposed, none abstained)

Ms. Martin's next item is about pencil cases in exams, she informed the committee that students are still bringing designed or non-see through pencil cases into the exams, and would like to see those not being brought into exams any longer. Ms. Martin's motion is to allow only clear pencil cases or plastic bags or nothing brought into exams.

- **Motion: Ms. K. Martin Seconded: Dr. P. Veale**
- **Motion: Passed** (all in favor, none opposed, none abstained)

Third topic for Ms. Martin is the font of exams, she passed around a few text font options to the committee for their viewing at the meeting while she discussed the use of Times New Roman font going forward. Mr. Amin asked if there was a preference for an accessibility font to which Ms. Martin responded that she had checked with Student Accessibility Services and there is no font preference with them. Dr. Busche asked if there was a possible way to poll the students in their preference over the fonts that will be used, him stating that they are the

ones that will see it and have to use it more than the rest of us. Motion to use Times New Roman font for exams going forward.

- **Motion: Ms. K. Martin** **Seconded: Dr. W. Woloschuk**
- **Motion: Not Passed** (4 in favor, 8 opposed, none abstained)

Ms. Martin's final item on the agenda is the post exam review, she stated that currently for midpoint exams and quizzes the UME offers full class reviews to help prepare for the summative, but wants to motion to no longer offer class reviews on the summative exams if the students have passed and are satisfactory as it is the end of the course. However, to still offer one-on-one reviews for students who were unsatisfactory. Ms. Martin's motion is to maintain full class reviews on midpoint exams and quizzes but to limit summative exam reviews to only those that were deemed unsatisfactory.

- **Motion: Ms. K. Martin** **Seconded: Mr. M. Paget**
- **Motion: Passed** (9 in favor, 3 opposed, none abstained)

New Business

a. Approval of Student Evaluation: Development and Maintenance(Dr. K. McLaughlin)

b. Approval of Student Evaluation: Reappraisal and Appeals (Dr. K. McLaughlin)

Mr. Kennedy would like to suggest an edit to item A7. He would like to remove boundaries of saying just the lectures' information, his suggestion is to be able to have any accredited sources that is evidence based should be able to use as reference for reappraisal of written evaluations and OSCE examinations. Motion for item A7 to include other reputable evidence based sources to use in case of a reappraisal situation.

- **Motion: Mr. W. Kennedy** **Seconded: Mr. M. Paget**
- **Motion: Passed** (All in favor, none opposed, none abstained)
- **Action:** Dr. K. McLaughlin to make changes and circulate again.

c. Proposed Clerkship Changes (Dr. P. Veale)

Dr. Veale introduced to the committee the new changes to clerkship that were approved in UMEC on Friday September 21st that starting for the class of 2021 the clerkship year has been extended, and in addition to the extension the clerkship rotation schedules are changing from a six-week structure to a four-week structure. Dr. Veale then gave a bit of a breakdown stating that there will two four week blocks of Family Medicine, two blocks of four weeks each of Internal Medicine, then the rotations that are currently six week blocks will then be divided in the most logical way for the rotation, the example she gave is Pediatrics which is currently a six week block and will be divided into a four week block and the two week block will be paired up with the Child and Adolescent Psychiatry two week block to make the second four week block. Electives will be removed from any mandatory rotations such as they currently are, and will mostly be up front and include a full four week elective block, which for most of the students will be at the beginning of their clerkship. Dr. Veale then stated the biggest goal for the committee is to look at the options for the evaluations as this change is being made, as the blocks and completion of rotations in some cases will not be close so an exam at the end of the rotation can't work for CARMs applications so how can there be a different distribution or sampling of exams that could work. Another question for the committee is how to make pass/fail decisions on rotations, currently the student needs to

pass on their clinical ITER and a written exam, how can they make this decision going forward.

There was quite a lengthy discussion from all members in regards to the breakdown and how this affects the rotations and their structures and how to proceed from how to break down a structure to the options how written examinations should take place. Written examination options included only after the first block with no assessment after the second block or conversely only after the second block and not after the first, testing after both blocks but only needing to pass one, write separate exams based on the separate blocks of the rotation and have each worth 50% and combine at the end of the rotation, and an option to do exams on an every three month or so basis rather than singular block exams. There was also discussion on challenging a second examination or block if the first examination and block is passed and that's a concern with some rotations that will teach different things in each block. A point noted by Dr. Albrecht is that a larger exam bank for the clerkship rotations might be needed for two or three versions of an exam for each rotation. Dr. Desy is hoping that it becomes a more competency base for clerks and have more emphasis on the ITER performance than the written component as the changes carry on. Mr. Paget has noted that there will be a use of logbooks for the students in their clerkship and that there is a possibility moving forward that there could be an exam based on upon the learnings of each student so far in their clerkship for a more individual based learning exam. Dr. McLaughlin has determined that this will again be a topic at next meeting and other meetings going forward until there is an examination decision.

d. Meetings for the Next Year (Dr. K. McLaughlin)

Dr. McLaughlin stated that the new updated dates were circulated before this meeting and there were no conflicts that have come forward thus far, if there are we will make changes as necessary.

e. Priorities for the Next Year (Dr. K. McLaughlin)

Dr. McLaughlin showed a presentation titled 'SEC Sept 28 2018' (PowerPoint attached) and discussed the evaluation directions for clerkship in the coming years. The presentation is based on the 12 Entrustable Professional Activities (EPA's) for the Transition from Medical School to Residency as set by The Association of Faculty of Medicine of Canada (AFMC), Dr. McLaughlin briefly went over the general EPA's (As seen on slide 5 of the presentation). Dr. McLaughlin then went into more detail on what the structure would look like based at the UME level (slides 6-9). He states the wanting to use this method will build up the competency base in the clerks better preparing them for residency and base their evaluations based on being observed and using different supervised based options based on the student proficiency. Dr. McLaughlin also pointed out that there is a larger opportunity for performance growth with using EPA standards over a below average, average, or above average rating scale on competency based components of clerkship evaluations. He informed the committee that this is the direction that clerkship evaluations are aimed to be headed in the next few years, and more will be discussed as this rolls out.

Meeting adjourned at 3:05 pm

Future meeting: Friday November 2nd 2018 1:00 – 3:00 pm HSC G701H – UME Boardroom