



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

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