

Program Evaluation and Assessment Committee (PEAC) Minutes

Date July 21, 2020

Time 9:30 – 11:00 AM PST

Attendees **Chair:** Matt Cunningham
Voting members: Michael Campion, Sara Kim, Edith Wang, Pete Fuerst, Martin Teintze, Cody Hansen, Zak Yaffe
Guests: Lida Lin, Signe Burchim, Doug Schaad, Marilyn Cope, Kellie Engle, Nick Cheung, Linda Ho

Regrets **Voting members:** Mark Whipple, Karen McDonough, Amanda Kost, Shobha Stack, Frank Batcha, Massoud Saleki,

AGENDA

| | ITEM | LEAD | TIME | ATTACHMENT | ACTION |
|---|-------------------------------|-----------------|--------|------------|------------|
| 1 | Approve June minutes | Matt Cunningham | 5 min | Yes | Decision |
| 2 | Foundations Assessment Update | Matt Cunningham | 5 min | Yes | Discussion |
| 3 | E18 Foundations EOP Report | Matt Cunningham | 80 min | Yes | Decision |

Next meeting: Thursday, August 20, 2020 3:30PM

1. Approve June minutes

Decision: Quorum achieved - minutes approved

Action: none

2. Foundations Assessment Update

Discussion: Matt shares there has not been much change since the June meeting.

- More input has been gathered and the plan is for it to be re-presented to the Foundations committee at their meeting next week for discussion and review. The remaining 5 recommendations will then be sent to the Curriculum Committee for final approval and implementation. Kellie confirmed she will request to have the Foundations Assessment added to the agenda.

Decision: none

Action: none

3. E18 Foundations EOP Report

Discussion: Matt shares report which will ultimately be shared with both the Foundations Committee and the Block Thread and Theme Leader group

- **Grades by block**
 - Mean percentages are relatively high – mostly between 85-90%
 - Number of failing grades are very low
- **Average block grades by site**
 - For the most part block grades are consistent across sites
 - Some PEAC members question the correlation between these scores and student readiness for Step 1 – can this data be used to better predict if students are truly prepared for Step 1?
 - Whether or not the block curriculum is rigorous enough based on the average passing grades being 85-90% continues to be a topic of discussion and a point of concern for some committee members
 - PEAC Exec Summary of E18 Foundations report is reviewed and updated
- **Exam Questions E18 blocks**
 - Data is reviewed across blocks with some focus on allotment of *Questions/day*
 - Committee discusses if there is any impact on final grades based on this aspect of the data
- **Thread scores**
 - Much like block grades, scores are consistent across sites
 - There are a few areas where the percentage of block questions seem low however this does not seem to have any impact on final scores across sites
- **E18 Block Exams Physician Tasks**
 - Committee reviews chart but no questions are raised

- **FCM final evaluations**
 - Vast majority of students have achieved a rating of “Milestone met” – percentages of students who are rated with “Area to work on” is very low
 - Ratings between E17 and E18 cohorts are similar
- **Foundations 2 OSCE Results**
 - Majority of students perform very well with very few students receive a rating of “Needs Development”
- **Course Evaluations**
 - Response rates by site percentages lead to discussion about how to motivate student feedback
 - Low response rates will be problematic for accreditation in the future – currently course evaluations are not mandatory
 - Additionally, the need for site by site data makes sampling some of the students as opposed to focusing on the whole ineffective
 - Is there a way to change how/when the evaluations are administered to increase participation/response rate?
 - It may be worth considering opening the evaluations earlier (the last week of the block) to give students a longer window to complete and submit it
- **Foundations End of Phase Survey**
 - The percentage of students who agree “My basic science courses prepared me well for clerkships” is surprisingly low
 - It is worth noting that students are asked this question prior to entering clerkships
 - It isn’t clear why “clinical skills training” rates much higher based on student feedback
- **Learning Environment**
 - The student response trend across categories is mostly positive
 - Sara Kim has additional relevant data which she will share when the results come in after August 1
- **Program Objectives Measured in Foundations**
 - Data reviewed by committee – no questions or comments at this time
- **Standards for Mastery of Program Objectives**
 - Matt poses a question to the committee: what is the standard of achievement for Foundations of Clinical Medicine with this new scale?
 - Committee discusses percentage of students meeting milestones and how the percentages will be impacted based on changing how student achievement is rated

Decision: none

Action: none