



Student Evaluation Committee (SEC) Minutes

Student Evaluation Committee (SEC)

APPROVED

Tuesday, September 22, 2020

2:00-4:00 PM

Meeting via Zoom

Attendees: Drs. (unless otherwise noted) Harish Amin, Sarah Anderson, Ms. Fiona Burns, Ms. Karen Chadbolt, Janeve Desy, Ms. Sue-Ann Facchini, Ms. Lindey Felske, Adrian Harvey, Carol Hutchison, Ms. Shannon Leskosky, Ms. Erica Lindquist, Ms. Kerri Martin, Kevin McLaughlin, Chris Naugler, Ms. Lily Oakenfold, Mr. Mike Paget, Jacques Rizkallah, Wayne Rosen, Mr. Matthew Sobczak, Ms. Sibyl Tai, Sarah Weeks, Mike Walsh

Regrets: Mr. Scott Bell, Glenda Bendiak, Kevin Busche, Melinda Davis, Ms. Samin Dolatabadi, Ms. Suzanne George, Tabitha Hawes, Jolene Haws, Kent Hecker, Deirdre Jenkins, Michelle Jung, Mr. Arjun Maini, Suneina Mohan, Ms. Laura Palmer, Lian Willetts

Guests: Dr Rithesh Ram

Call to Order

The meeting was conducted through Zoom and was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by Dr. K. McLaughlin (Chair). Welcome to members and note that Dr. Rithesh Ram would enter the meeting at the time of Item 3. UCLIC MCQs on site and proctored locally. Added to Item 6 – New Business – Med Skills OSCE (Dr. McLaughlin). Everyone introduced themselves and their role on SEC. Dr. McLaughlin welcomed the new VP students from the Class of 2023, Ms. Erica Lindquist and Ms. Lindey Felske.

1. Approval of Meeting Agenda (with above addition) – Approved.

2. Approval of Minutes from June 16th, 2020 Meeting – Approved.

3. Standing Items

3.1 Other Committees:

Pre-Clerkship – Release of Grades: Dr. Weeks indicated that the students would like to challenge when grades are released prior to all components of evaluation are completed and want to propose a motion. It is not certain whether this is a collective proposal. However, as the students are not in attendance, this will be deferred. Dr. Weeks indicated a discussion today would be useful.

UMEC – no report at this time.

Clerkship – UCLIC MCQs Exams Written at Student's Rural Site(s): Dr. Ram (with Dr. Busche's agreement) suggested UCLIC MCQs be written and proctored locally where the students work in clinics, and/or a place (i.e. U of Lethbridge) close to their area, similar to the details approved for students in Yellowknife, as per last minutes. This is due to COVID, and the alleviation of travelling to Calgary for the MCQs, especially in the winter. Questions were raised as to how to address students questions during the exam and it was noted that specific physicians in Calgary, could be 'on call' to take questions. Ms. Martin noted that student exam accommodations may be as long as 5 hours, and suggested that the

exam begin early enough to accommodate any student's questions that might arise during the work day. This was agreed upon. Dr. McLaughlin recommended that proctoring be consistent at each site, with identification of the proctors. Ms. Facchini and Ms. Martin will develop proctoring standards, including recommended secure areas for the students to write at their rural areas (i.e. in a private room, within a clinic). Some students would prefer to write in Calgary. It was agreed that the default would be for students to write at their sites. It was agreed that students must provide a 2 week notice to request change of site to write exams in Calgary, if desired. It was noted that the proctors do not officially have to be appointments with the University of Calgary. It was suggested that perhaps a 10 minute podcast could be developed for proctors, with post-questions answered, as an onboarding tool.

Proposal: Dr. McLaughlin proposed, assuming all proctoring standards were the same at all sites, that UCLIC students write exams at their rural sites (as a default) in a private pre-assigned room, during the COVID. Students must provide 10 business day's notice if they prefer to write in Calgary and it must be at the time that the exam is set. Details as noted above.

All in favour.

Clerkship - EPAs for Students Extending Clerkship, limited clerkship, staggered clerkship: Dr. McLaughlin brought forth the recommendations from Dr. Busche regarding three scenarios as noted:

- It was recommended that Clerks who are doing an extended clerkship after not matching in 2020 do not have to complete EPAs. They have met the requirements for graduation in the spring of 2020. Recommend Clerkship extenders – no EPAs required.
- One student has a requirement to complete only a single rotation due to academic difficulties as it is not feasible to complete all the EPAs in that short time. Recommended no EPAs required.
- One student has returned from an LOA and has a total of 14 weeks to complete. It was recommended that this student did not have to complete 43 EPAs, and it would be difficult to do so successfully in that time. Recommended partial subset of EPAs to complete (20, one from each).
- One student has been granted an unusual schedule, and approved and will begin two blocks of clerkship this fall. This person will then move in with the class of 2022 in January. Recommend all EPAs with collection starting now, assuming continuation with class of 2022.

Proposal: Dr. McLaughlin proposed to accept the above recommendations from Dr. Busche regarding EPAs for students, as noted above.

All in favour.

3.2 Student Reports: The class of 2021 noted some student found the EPAs somewhat difficult and others found it easier. Question was asked in regards to mandatory EPAs, the wording appeared to be ambiguous, and the students interpreted this to mean that they were to ensure the 2 EPAs be completed. Dr. Harvey clarified that the preceptors can not be forced to complete EPAs, it is at the request of the students. Dr. McLaughlin will ask Dr. Busche to clarify this to the students. Class of 2023 student representative noted the Population Health short answer, multiple choice format wasn't clear. Recommended a better style to the exam team. Dr. McLaughlin asked for them to compile some practical suggestions to co-chairs or to Dr. Harvey, including SEC. Concerns were added to exam feedback and Dr. Harvey will discuss this further with Dr. Murray Lee and Dr. Patrick Lee.

3.3 Academic Technologies: Mr. Paget noted that the reporting mechanism on clerkship and cards were rolled out. He noted the transition from TBL and updated course breakdowns of Course II. Mr. Paget confirmed that the use of arcs (cards) in a formative style will be discussed further after this meeting, as it does not have a structure as yet.

3.4 Evaluation Team: Ms. Martin reported that they are continuing to defer exam scrambling. Students are seated at exams 2 meters away from each other. For the class of 2023, 7 exam places must be procured, with invigilators at each place. This takes an enormous amount of UME staff to handle. Appreciation and thanks were conveyed, as this process is very labour intensive.

4. Old Business/Updates – n/a

5. Reports – n/a

6. New Business – Medical Skills OSCE: Dr. McLaughlin presented slide results on the MSI OSCE. He noted the OSCE went very well. There were 6 stations in the OSCE. He noted the scale for rating performance. As per the Hofstee parameters: Lowest number of stations student must pass to pass OSCE overall = 4 Highest number of stations student must pass to pass OSCE overall = 6. Lowest acceptable failure rate = 0% Highest acceptable failure rate = 20% Performance of students is plotted, and the 'cut point' is 5.06 stations to pass, rounding off. This 'cut line' as shown in the box on the graph can be utilized at any time in the future. This is how they will be able to adjust each year. AS the pass rate this year is 5.9%, all students passed. This process is a means to find the pass mark. It may shift. 4 was chosen as the lower limit and 6 as the upper limit, and a compromise is arrived at within the box. If the exam questions were too hard, the box would move to the left. The final decision has to be made after the exam. Dr. McLaughlin noted that there was 147 students, one had 4 out of 6, which is an outlier. 141 (95.9%) passed all 6 stations. Six (4.1%) passed 5 out of 6 stations. Dr. Rosen gave a huge thanks to an enormous amount of people, UME, preceptors, etc., that provided a herculean effort to go above and beyond their roles to develop this OSCE. Dr. Amin noted the national failure is 3 to 5%

Proposal: Dr. McLaughlin proposed to accept the above recommendations to utilize the Hofstee parameters, with the above details in establishing the lowest acceptable number of stations and the highest acceptable number of stations to arrive at a pass mark in the Cut point.

All in favour.

Orientation to New Student Representatives: Dr. McLaughlin noted that as there this committee discussed various items related to exams, all information at this committee level, and any other UME committee level, must be confidential. There is a Confidentiality Agreement to be signed by new members and Ms. Oakenfold will send this out to be signed.

SEC Terms of Reference: Dr. McLaughlin noted that this will be distributed prior to the next meeting and asked members to review it with any recommendations for changes to be sent to him.

Dr. McLaughlin thanked members for their input. **Meeting adjourned @ 3:20 p.m.**

Minutes by: Lily Oakenfold

Edited by Dr. K. McLaughlin