

Student Evaluation Committee (SEC)

APPROVED

May 18th 2018

Room G701H - UME Boardroom

Attendees: Drs. Heather Baxter, Kevin Busche, Sylvain Coderre, Melinda Davis, Kevin McLaughlin (Chair), Travis Ogilvie, Wayne Woloschuk, Ms. Na'ama Avitzur, Ms. Sue-Ann Facchini, Mr. William Kennedy (teleconference), Ms. Shannon Leskosky, Mr. Mike Paget, Ms. Sibyl Tai, Ms. Danielle Goss (minutes)

Regrets: Drs. Kelly Albrecht, Glenda Bendiak, Vick Chahal, Sophia Chou, Ron Cusano, Janeve Desy, Doan Le, Charles Leduc, Pamela Veale, Ms. Kathryn Brockman, Ms. Kerri Martin, Ms. Sarah Smith, Mr. Matthew Sobzack

1. Approval of Agenda

The May 18th 2018 SEC Agenda was approved

• Motion: Dr. H. Baxter Seconded: Dr. T. Ogilvie

2. Approval of March 2nd 2018 Minutes

The March 2nd 2018 SEC Minutes were approved.

• Motion: Ms. N. Avitzur Seconded: Dr. H. Baxter

Reports and Standing Items

a. Report From Students

Ms. N. Avitzur, noted that in recent meetings the student votes have been low due to changes of attendance through clerkship, electives and other school requirements. She had stated that in case not all students could attend the meetings that if one, or more, student did that they could have the vote for all three years, therefore having three votes total. Ms. Avitzur's proposal is that student representatives are able to vote by proxy for the other student committee members, where they feel confident and that they would agree, when are absent; see motion below.

Ms. Avitzur also commented on the difference between clerkship and pre-clerkship exam formats and how to study for them. Dr. McLaughlin responded to Ms. Avitzur's concern by

saying that historically the clerkship exam marks have been higher than the pre-clerkship MCQ exams, but he appreciated the added complexity of different evaluation formats for different clerkship rotations and the added time pressures of being on clinical rotations and having on-call requirements.

Ms Avitzur brought up the ITER process for clerkship rotations and that the collection of daily ITERs with different preceptors. Some rotations have a designated individual to collect daily ITERs from preceptors and take them to one person for the One45 input, while other rotations have the student collecting them and giving them to their preceptors directly. Ms. Avitzur's questioned if that should be something that is made consistent through clerkship. Dr. Davis did respond saying that there is a great deal of communication amongst all the preceptors the student works with during their rotations to provide thorough and honest feedback for the students' evaluation, she also said however that she's unsure of how formal of a process this is with all the different rotations. Mr. Paget brought up the advantages and disadvantages of paper electronic ITERs. The biggest difference being the online ITER has the advantage of written feedback that the student can access and can be seen when they've accessed the evaluation, whereas paper ITERs allow for more verbal feedback while completing in front of a student so it may not reflect the same information on the ITER. Dr. McLaughlin stated that evaluations will move in the direction of more competency-based ITERs, as will bring this point up in a future Clerkship Committee meeting for clerkship input.

Mr. Kennedy noted that there seems to be some confusion for students with the AEBM material that is given to the students and taught versus what was on the exam.

Ms. Avitzur's proposal is that student representatives are able to vote by proxy for other student committee members, where they feel confident and that the missing members would agree when are absent.

• Motion: Ms. N. Avitzur Seconded: Dr. K. McLaughlin

Motion: Passed

b. UMEC

Dr. Coderre updated the committee on the task forces final report of the Anatomy course, which should be available in the June UMEC meeting. He also noted the proposal of extending the clerkship rotations longer by two-to-six weeks that is currently being looked at by UMEC.

c. Preclerkship

Dr. Busche noted that the Introduction to Clinical Practice Course does not currently have an evaluation component, the course is based upon attendance, assignments and deadlines for items that have been given based upon the structure or an excused absence. If a student fails to hand in an assignment on time there should be some form of evaluation process to say whether this is a fail or non-fail rating. Dr. Busche informed the committee that Dr. Seto, the current course chair, was wondering what the remediation could be if there was someone that did not hand in an assignment on time. Dr. Seto's suggestion would be preparing a presentation to show the chair based on the topic(s) of the course that the student missed, which will need to have a satisfactory performance to be able to pass the course. Dr. McLaughlin then brought up the professionalism standards for remediating, in every course, that it should be considered a standard "first strike" professionalism similar to other courses. A second strike in this scenario would then be an appearance at SARC. Dr. Busche then stated about the students' transcript and how they will represent this course for the student to

receive credit should there be an unsatisfactory or remediation needed on this course. Ms. Avitzur stated from a student standpoint that the individual presentation seems a little excessive and shameful for a student that has missed a day or a deadline for a strong reason, she stated that it could be considered a strike, but feels that the attendance and assignments should satisfactory enough evaluation for this course. Dr. Busche's proposal is if assignments in ICP are not handed in by the deadline that students will be considered to have had a professionalism lapse which will trigger a meeting with the assistant dean of preclerkship; who will then have the authority to recommend that the student complete the CMPA module on professionalism in supervised fashion within the UME.

• Motion: Dr. K. Busche Seconded: Dr. T. Ogilvie

• Motion: Passed

d. Clerkship

Please see point 4B in New Business Items

e. Evaluation Planning Subcommittee

Not discussed this meeting.

f. Accreditation Issues

Dr. Coderre informed the committee that midpoint feedback was sent away in March based upon the 10 standards, unsure of when we will be getting a full report back from Accreditation.

g. Academic Technologies

Mr. Paget expressed that we have completed a full OSCE season using Dolphin, there were some struggles but with the team working on these issues they seem to have worked out most of the issues. He also noted that they are working toward access provisioning to Dolphin for evaluation coordinators, this will give them access to view the questions associated with their course or clerkship, including viewing ITER data from students as well.

h. Evaluation Team

Not discussed in this meeting.

New Business

a. Approval of TOR (Dr. K. McLaughlin)

Dr. McLaughlin presented the revised TOR for committee review (attached), he discussed the changes that were made and reviewed certain parts of the TOR. Dr. McLaughlin also brought up the topic of achieving quorum and increasing membership by being able to include the UME management staff as voting members. Dr. Baxter brought the concern of the possibility of having a UME only vote based upon the other voting representatives. Dr. McLaughlin responded by offering to have a maximum vote limit to the UME staff based upon a certain percentage or through the Chair offering the option to postpone the vote until there is a more diverse voter representation. There were some revised changes that were made to the TOR live during the meeting, with Dr. McLaughlin to make any further changes. Dr. McLaughlin's proposal is to include UME management the ability to vote, and accept the TOR.

Motion: Dr. T. Ogilvie Seconded: Dr. H. Baxter

• Motion: Passed

b. Notification of Student Appeals (Dr. K. McLaughlin for Dr. P. Veale)

Dr. McLaughlin presented Dr. Veale's concern with the notification of Student Appeals, currently the student appealing contacts Dr. Ogilvie and going forward will be Dr. Desy, however Dr. Veale feels that instead of just the Evaluation Director knows that the corresponding Assistant Dean and the Student Advisory and Wellness office is made aware of the appeal as well. Dr. Ogilvie explained that currently the process is to start with Dr. Ogilvie then the appeal is given to Dr. Coderre and Ms. Malus (Dr. Coderre's administrative assistant), the Student Advisory and Wellness office, and the chair of the course. Going forward the operational procedure for student appeals the appropriate Assistant Dean will be notified as well.

c. SEC Membership (Dr. K. McLaughlin)

This was jointly discussed in the Approval of TOR section under New Business A on the Agenda.

d. Clerkship OSCE (Dr. K. McLaughlin)

Dr. McLaughlin presented a powerpoint presentation on the Clerkship OSCE (attached). Dr. McLaughlin discussed the presentation about setting the MPL from last meeting for the Clerkship OSCE as a refresher to those that weren't in attendance before presenting this new information. He noted that, on slide 3, the MPL was set at 6 successful stations needed to pass, both days averaging under 15% failure rate. Based upon this information they look at the adjustment required for the encounters of a Hawk or Dove, see slides 5 and 6, that there were both present during examinations. Dr. McLaughlin then talked about the rewrite process and how no student failed a station they had already passed, and the rewrites were successful and no one ended up failing. Also there were no students who failed a station on the rewrite that passed on the first OSCE. Going forward Dr. McLaughlin noted that they would like to do rewrites differently if, for example, a student passed five stations the first time, they would have an OSCE of three stations where they needed to pass only one to get to the required six. Dr. McLaughlin then suggested the use of having examiners be reviewed by the students based on their station, Dr. Baxter's concern was the possibility of the inconsistency of the examiners going forward if they feel they are being reviewed. Mr. Paget commented to this being the possibility of losing evaluators if they are seen as Hawks and their scores get removed from the students they evaluated, his suggestion is to just monitor it and keep a Hawk/Dove track rather than a singular evaluation for the evaluator. Dr. McLaughlin is hoping the process of performing a sensitivity analysis for Hawk/Dove effect should reduce appeal rates for OSCE scores since students are given the higher score based upon the Hawk/Dove adjustments.

e. Improving Validity and Quality of Exams (Dr. K. McLaughlin)

Dr. McLaughlin prepared a presentation based upon the handout, 'Process for Handling Individual Knowledge Exam Results 3' (attached). Dr. McLaughlin went through page one of the handout called 'Cycle for improving/maintaining exam validity and quality' he explained that creating validity is achieving a goal – ensuring students are ready for residency. Setting the MPL is a minimum of 10 non-experts which creates a more accurate cut score. Dr. McLaughlin then described the Hofstee Compromise Method, as shown on page two of the document. Using examples shown from his diagrams through the remaining pages of the documents he discussed that the statistics from the previous five years in Course I has a consistent cut-point of 69%. Dr. McLaughlin went onto discuss the standard error of measurement process and what is considered being borderline for the students. He noted that about 10 students pass but are considered borderline, his suggestion is to mentor more

students that are considered borderline going forward. Ms. Facchini raised a concern on how this would be flagged through to the coordinators/exam team whether they are unsatisfactory, satisfactory with mentoring, or satisfactory; Dr. McLaughlin informed her that he receives the information based upon examination scores, then meets with Dr. Busche to review the course and examination material and evaluation data. To which they would take the students they feel are borderline and meet with them and go through the mentorship process. Mr. Kennedy inquired if the Student Advising and Wellness office will be made aware of the students that are going through mentoring to which Dr. McLaughlin confirmed they will be informed and they will know how best to proceed with the mentorship of students. Dr. McLaughlin's proposal is setting the new MPL to the Hofstee compromise method and using mentoring for the new standard deviation.

• Motion: Mr. M. Paget Seconded: Dr. H. Baxter

• Motion: Passed

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

Dr. McLaughlin stated as we ran over time this meeting this point will be added to the next meetings agenda.

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

Dr. McLaughlin stated as we ran over time this meeting this point will be added to the next meetings agenda.

Meeting adjourned at 3:15 pm

Future meeting: Friday September 28th 2018 1:00 – 3:00 pm UME Boardroom G701H